I. 5. 29
K. 16. 54

AN

ANTIDOTE AGAINST ANABAPTISM,

IN A

Reply to the Plea for *Anabaptiſts:*

OR

ANIMADVERSIONS

On that part of the

Libertie of Propheſying

Which *Sect.* 18. *p.* 223. beareth this Title:

A Particular Conſideration of the Opinion of the ANABAPTISTS.

Together with a Survey of the controverted points

Concerning
1. Infant-baptiſm.
2. Pretended neceſſitie of Dipping.
3. The dangerous practice of Rebaptizing.

By *JO. READING*, B.D. and ſometimes Student of *Magdalen Hall* in *OXFORD.*

LACTANT. LIB. V. CAP. I.

Quid igitur? operám ne perdemus? minimè. Nam ſi lucrari hos à morte ad quam concitatiſsime tendunt, non potuerimus, ſi ab illo itinere devio, ad vitam, lucemque revocare, quoniam ipſi ſaluti ſuæ repugnant, noſtros tamen confirmabimus.

LONDON, Printed by *Tho. Newcomb*, for *Simon York*, and *Richard Barley*, dwelling in *Dover*, 1654.



TRINITY COLLEGE
LIBRARY
CAMBRIDGE
C



To the Right Worſhipful

Sir *WILLIAM BROCKMAN*

KNIGHT;

And to his truly vertuous Lady

The LADY *ANNE BROCKMAN.*

THIS *Antiphraſtical* age perverting terms to contrary meanings, calling Truth Falſhood, Falſhood Truth, Vertue Vice, and Vice Vertue, &c. not only minds us of *Epheſian Wolves* and ſpekers of [a] *perverſe things*, but evidently ſhews, that the time of which the Apoſtle warned, is not *inſtant* but *extant*. The deaf Adders will not be charmed, or hearing [b] *endure ſound doctrine* ([c] that's bitter

[a] διεστραμμένα Act. 20.30.

[b] 2 Tim. 4.3,4

[c] *Amara ſunt vitioſis ac malè viventibus præcepta juſtitiæ.* Lactant. l. 1. c. 4.

to the wicked) but *after their own lusts heap up to themselves Teachers* (like *Jeroboams* [d]*Priests* of the *lowest of the people*) *having itching ears.* We have so much experience hereof, that we cannot but know that for the loud-crying sins of this Nation proceeding from contempt of his Word and Ministry, the Lord hath smitten many tongues and ears with a worse then [g] *Egyptian plague*, a spiritual [h] *botch, scab, incurable itch, madness, blindness and astonishment of heart*, so that they [i] hate the light and learning, [k] becaus they would have all like themselves, that their ignorance might lie hid in one common darkness, unreproved, undiscovered; all which like a shril Trumpet from the clouds of heaven, sounding lowder and lowder, gives the alarm to all faithful *Ministers to* [l] *take heed to themselves and to all the flock over which the H. Ghost hath made them overseers*: spiritually furnished, like those repairers of the Temple, both for [m] building and defence, taking to them the whole [n] *armour of God*, that they *may be able to stand.* I may safely say, no one age ever felt such various oppositions of

d 1 Kng. 12. 31 ὃ τὸ ἀδιάκειτον πλῆθος τῶν διδασκάλων. Oecum. in 2 Tim. 4. 3. κνηθόμενοι τὴν ἀκοήν. 2 Tim. 4. 3.

g Deut. 28. 27.

h πατάξαι σε ψώρᾳ ἀνιάτῳ---λώρᾳ ἀγρίᾳ καὶ κνήφῃ. i Joh. 3. 3, 20.

k ὅτι βέλουσι' αὐ ἀπαιδίας εἰς ναθ' ἑαυτοὺς, ἵν' ἐν τῷ κοινῷ τὸ καθ' αὐτοὺς κρύπτηται, καὶ τοῦ τῆς ἀπαιδευσίας ἐλέγχου διαδιδράσκωσιν. Gr. Nazianz. orat. 20.

l Act. 20. 28.

m Nehem. 4. 17

n Eph. 6. 13.

of truth; Satan seeming in former times but to skirmish, but now to storm the [o]beloved City and Tents of the Saints with all his Legions of errours drawn up into one body: of all which none more infest or hinder our work, then those *Moabites* and *Ammonites*; [p] who contrary to Gods ordinance, have intruded into the work of the Temple, pretending to build with us; saying with those enemies of *Israel*, [q] *We seek your God as ye do.* Now the *noon-tide* Devil is on the Stage in his last scene, whose part is (if it [r]were possible) *to deceive the very Elect.* To which no ordinary dress can now fit him or his Ministers; it must be (and so is) some close semblance of sanctimony, in which the Saints delight; without which *Satan* could not easily take them, with which he often doth; whilst [s] incautiously credulous, they are deceived by those whom they esteemed [t] good. The hunters of *Ostriches* used to dress themselves up with their feathers, imitate their motions, and scatter grains of seeds before them; so the false [u] Apostles, *deceitful workers*, seduce by transforming themselves into

o Rev. 20. 9.

p Deut. 23. 3.

q Ezra 4. 2.

r Mat. 24. 24.

[s] *Incautè creduli circumveniuntur ab iis quos bonos putabant.*

[t] Minuc. Fel. Oct. Τρεφόμενοι δ' αὐτοὶ οἱ μὲν τόξοις, οἱ δὲ ταῖς δορυξοῖς ἄλλοι σφενδόναις (χειραδίοις.. τῷ δὲ ἀεισεσὰ σπέρμα σφεν γένεσιν, &c. Strab. l. 16.

u 2 Cor. 11. 13, 15.

into *Apoſtles of Chriſt, Miniſters of righteouſneſs*; ſcattering out of their delightful bags, ſeeds of dangerous Hereſies and Schiſms.

Why I undertook this *polemical* task, you know who were preſent at my firſt imbarquing in this controverſie; as alſo many of my reverend brethren, who afterwards importuned me to the firſt part hereof. If any ask, why it comes out ſo late to publike view? let the falſe *[u] Zibaes* anſwer; I can conjecture but not reſolve; it is now about two years ſince it was much deſired, fairly promiſed, and accordingly ſent to one Preſs; where the *[x] children* were *come to the birth* and there was *no ſtrength to bring forth.* Why I write after ſo many, ſo much more able to defend the truth, might poſſibly put me to the *Oratours quære-* [y] *What is left for me to do?* but new adverſaries ariſing, giving freſh aſſaults, and impudently affronting and challenging me in my publike charge to anſwer them; what could I have anſwered the Lord, if ſeeing the Wolf coming into the fold, I had withdrawn or betrayed

[u] 2 Sam. 16.3. [z] 2 Sam. 19.25, &c.

[x] Vid. Iſa. 37.3

[y] *Quæ ſunt igitur meæ partes, &c. Cic. orat. pro L. Cornel. Balb. init.*

the

the ſouls of my Auditors; who might poſſibly have thought our cauſe deſerted, for which none durſt plead. All lovers of truth owe it reſpective defence: and too much caution cannot be in things of ſo great moment as ſalvation of [z] ſouls. No man rationally asketh, What need we two eyes who can ſee with one? I am far from pleading univerſality for defence, or multitudes for Patronage of truth: let our adverſaries reckon themſelves many, and think that ——— *Illos*

Defendit numerus, junctæque umbone Phalanges:

They have many Writers; but if the cauſe be weighed by Scripture and ſolid reaſon, then as [a] *Eliſha* ſaid, *they are more with us then with them*: yet I heartily wiſh that many more would ſhew themſelves on our part, and neither betray the truth by their ſilence, who can ſeaſonably and ably ſpeak in its defence, nor encourage the adverſaries thereof by ſuch a *Laodicea*-like lukewarmneſs as ſhews a dangerous ſymptome of neutralitie. For my part I cannot but be conſcious of much diſabilitie, yet dare not but endeavour to defend the [b] truth: for

[z] *Similiter facis, ac ſi me roges, cur te duobus contuear oculis, & non altero tantum, cum idem uno aſſequi poſſim. Cic. de nat. deor. l. 3.*

[a] 2 King. 6.16.

[b] περὶ τούτων ἡμᾶς ὁ βουλόμενος εὐδωκήτω, ἢ ἀρκείτω. *Gr. Nazianz. Orat. 13.*

into *Apoſtles of Chriſt, Miniſters of righteouſneſs*; ſcattering out of their delightful bags, ſeeds of dangerous Hereſies and Schiſms.

Why I undertook this *polemical* task, you know who were preſent at my firſt imbarquing in this controverſie; as alſo many of my reverend brethren, who afterwards importuned me to the firſt part hereof. If any ask, why it comes out ſo late to publike view? let the falſe *[u] Zibaes* anſwer; I can conjecture but not reſolve; it is now about two years ſince it was much deſired, fairly promiſed, and accordingly ſent to one Preſs; where the *[x] children* were *come to the birth* and there was *no ſtrength to bring forth.* Why I write after ſo many, ſo much more able to defend the truth, might poſſibly put me to the *Oratours quære-* [y] *What is left for me to do?* but new adverſaries ariſing, giving freſh aſſaults, and impudently affronting and challenging me in my publike charge to anſwer them; what could I have anſwered the Lord, if ſeeing the Wolf coming into the fold, I had withdrawn or betrayed

[u] 2 Sam. 16.3. 2 Sam. 19.25, &c.

[x] Vid. Iſa. 37.3

[y] *Quæ ſint igitur mea partes, &c. Cic. orat. pro L. Cornel. Balb. init.*

the

the ſouls of my Auditors; who might poſſibly have thought our cauſe deſerted, for which none durſt plead. All lovers of truth owe it reſpective defence: and too much caution cannot be in things of ſo great moment as ſalvation of ᶻſouls. No man rationally asketh, What need we two eyes who can ſee with one? I am far from pleading univerſality for defence, or multitudes for Patronage of truth: let our adverſaries reckon themſelves many, and think that ——— *Illos*

Defendit numerus, junctaque umbone Phalanges:

They have many Writers; but if the cauſe be weighed by Scripture and ſolid reaſon, then as [a] *Eliſha* ſaid, *they are more with us then with them*: yet I heartily wiſh that many more would ſhew themſelves on our part, and neither betray the truth by their ſilence, who can ſeaſonably and ably ſpeak in its defence, nor encourage the adverſaries thereof by ſuch a *Laodicea*-like lukewarmneſs as ſhews a dangerous ſymptome of neutralitie. For my part I cannot but be conſcious of much diſabilitie, yet dare not but endeavour to defend the [b] truth: for

ᶻ *Similiter facis, ac ſi me roges, cur te duobus contuear oculis, & non altero tantum, cum idem uno aſſequi poſſim. Cic. de nat. deor. l. 3.*

[a] 2 King. 6. 16.

[b] περὶ τούτων ἡμᾶς ὁ βελόμενος εὐδωκήτω, ἢ ἀρκείτω. *Gr. Nazianz. Orat. 13.*

for this, let whoſo will condemn or acquit me; God is all-ſufficient. Such as theſe endeavours are, I ſubmit to the judgment of the [c]*Church of God, the pillar of truth*, and dedicate them to you who love the truth; and by Gods aſſiſtance [d] will not be *negligent to put you alwayes in remembrance of theſe things, though you know them, and be eſtabliſhed in the preſent truth; yea, I think it meet, as long as I am in this Tabernacle.* God alone gives the [e] encreaſe: To him be [f]*glory in the higheſt, and on earth peace, good will towards men*: to you and yours, conſtancie in the truth, and happineſs temporal and eternal; which is the daily prayer of

c 1 Tim. 3. 15.

d 2 Pet. 2. 12, 13.

e 1 Cor. 3. 6, 7.

f Luc. 2. 14.

Decemb. 8. 1653.

Your faithful and affectionate

Servant in the Lord Jeſus

JO. READING.

The Preface to the Christian and Candid Reader.

Made with Mr *Fisher* at *Folkston* in *Kent*, *Mar.* 10, 1650.

Good Reader know, that as I was addressing my self to discharge a publike Engagement, for writing something in answer to certain Objections made against Pædobaptism, there came to my hand from a friend, a Treatise under this Title, ΘΕΟΛΟΓΙΑ ΕΚΛΕΚΤΙΚΗ. *The Liberty of Prophesying, &c.* in the 18 section whereof, I finde, *A particular consideration of the opinion of the Anabaptists*; In which part of this *Floralegia*, or *flowers and selected points of Divinity*, are not onely some stingy expressions, but also such a wilful or incautious collection of wilde Vines, as may cause the children of the Pro-

2 King 4.39,40 phets not unjuſtly to cry, *Mors eſt in olla*. It was truly reported by ſome judicious Divines, who had peruſed the ſame, that there are many dangerous ſtumbling-blocks to weak Chriſtians, and ſubtil arguments for defence and animation of the *Anabaptiſts*, being cloathed with ſo much wit, ſophiſtry and learning, as indeed make the *Piece* a very ſhrewd *Bug-bear*, formidable to many; yet in truth 'tis not much unlike that *Cuman-beaſt*, which going up and down in a Lions skin, frighted many, which being pulled off, the ſilly *Animal* appeared more ridiculous then dangerous. Being therefore exhorted by ſundry of my reverend brethren, to anſwer the Arguments herein laid down by way of *Plea* (I hope rather tentatively, then dogmatically) and being perſwaded, that in ſo doing I might in a great part ſatisfie my engagement, the learned Author having ſaid much more, or in more plauſible terms, then ever the *Anabaptiſts*, for ought that I have ever ſeen or heard have yet alledged for their own opinion, I have adventured ſo to do.

Judg. 2. 16; And now concerning my learned Antagoniſt,

goniſt, although I hope he let fall theſe things, as *Boaz Reapers*, on purpoſe that ſome might for good advantage to the truth of Chriſt glean after him; yet ſeeing he hath ſo ſharply and ſtrenuouſly pleaded againſt the ſame; that Religion may ſay of her hurts on ſome leſs armed parts, *Thus was I wounded in the houſe of my friends*: And we may ſay in theſe giddy times, as *Joſhua* to him whom he ſpied with his drawn ſword by *Jericho*, *Art thou for us, or for our adverſaries?* and ſeeing that they who for private ends and intereſts carry arms and ammunition to any known and profeſſed enemies, are juſtly made lawful prize, at leaſt, if taken; we muſt lay by all perſonal intereſts, with a *magis amica veritas*; and he ought to be patient if he meet with any more rough and unpleaſing language then he uſeth to receive, or I love to give.

Zach. 13. 6.

Ioſh. 5. 13.

Concerning this whole peece, I have no more to ſay, then that of *Venerable Beda*, concerning the Book of *Biſhop Julian* to the Reader, let him ſo gather the grapes, that he may beware of the thorn; that is, let him

Ita carpat botrum, ut & ſpinam caveat. i.e. in dictis ejus ſanos ſenſus ſcrutetur & eligat, ut non minus vitet inſanos. Bed. in Cant. exp. l. 1. exord.

him in his ſayings, ſearch and chooſe out the wholſom ſenſe, ſo as with no leſs care he may avoid the unwholſom. He doth but plead, and ſo pretend to a lawfulneſs of biting us, from the priviledge of cuſtom; and ſo in reaſon muſt expect the like returns: If he that dreſſeth himſelf up in a Bears skin, to make others or himſelf ſport, be ſeriouſly baited, whom hath he to blame but himſelf? What this Authours councel was, thus to write that which himſelf condemns, and of which he ſaith, it is *A Doctrine juſtly condemned by the moſt ſorts of Chriſtians* —— I know not; but do heartily wiſh, that if he have not yet repented of digging this pit, whereinto divers are fallen, not without great and apparent hazard to their ſouls, he timely may; if he have come to ſome ſecond better thoughts, he may do commendably to cover it with ſome ſeaſonable endeavour, that no more may fall by the ſtumbling-block which he hath laid before them: I wiſh he would reviſe his own writings with ſome judiciary ſeverity, as St. *Auguſtine* ſpeaks, ſo that thoſe things which his ſelf liketh

P. 123. l. N. 2.

Quadam judiciariâ ſeveritate. Aug. retract. l. prolog.

liketh not in his plea, he might mark and cenſure: he need not be informed, but may be remembred, that true repentance is inſeparably united to a ſincere deſire, & faithful endeavor to ſatisfie and make amends; neither is he to learn what that great light of the Weſtern Church ſaith: ——*No man*, (ſaith he) *that's wiſe, will therefore preſume to reprove me, becauſe I reprehend my own errours: but if he ſhall ſay, I ought not to have ſaid ſuch things which ſhould afterward even diſpleaſe my ſelf, he ſaith true, and doth as I do; for he reprehends thoſe very things which I alſo do; for neither ought I to reprove them, if I ought to have ſaid them:* What he did in his Retractations, many good and learned men have done, becauſe they loved Gods truth and honour more then their own reputations: and whoſoever can truly ſay with S *Peter*, *Thou knoweſt that I love thee*, ought no more to be aſhamed of the fruits of Repentance, then *Peter* was: It is no diſhonor to amend, and turn to better, and therefore it cannot but be ſafe to give God his due honour, and ſecurity to thoſe ſouls who have ſtrayed, been

Neque enim quiſquam niſi imprudens, ideo quia mea errata reprehendi, me reprehendere audebit: ſed ſi dicit non debuiſſe ea à me dici quæ poſtea mihi etiam diſpliceret, verum dicet, & mecum facit; eorum quippe reprehenſor eſt, quorum & ego; nec enim ea reprehendere deberem, ſi dicere debuiſſem, &c. Aug. 4. ſup.

been miſled, or ſcandaled by this Patronage of untruth, by acknowledging the truth, and diſavowing a known errour. He denyeth Chriſt, who is ſilent for fear or favor of men, when and where he ought to ſpeak in defence of his truth; how much more he that doth *omnes nerves intendere*, in the oppoſition thereof? poſſibly the Authour had ſome better intention and aim then appears to the Vulgar; but 'tis true, *it skilleth not with what intention one doth that which is evil, and ought not to be done*; becauſe facts are ſeen, but the minde is not. Let the good Reader take notice, that in the concluſion of this Plea, the advocate ſaith, *That men have diſputed againſt them* (the Anabaptiſts) *with ſo much weakneſs and confidence, that they have been encouraged in their errour more by the accidental advantages we have given them by our weak arguings, then by any truth of their cauſe, or excellency of their wit*: And I conceive that he will think with me, that it ſhould be a motive to him, to whom God hath given more excellency of art and nature to defend the truth which he hath oppoſed, leſt otherwiſe

Itqui nihil interest quo animo facias, quod fecisse vitiosum est, quia facta cernuntur, animus non videtur. Lactant. l. 3. c. 3 p. 221.

otherwiſe he ſacrilegiouſly eclipſe Gods honour, by a kinde of Interpoſition of that body which ſhineth by no other light then that which God lent. If he that hid his Maſters talent, ſo that it did neither good nor harm, yet heard his δῦλε πόνηρε, what (except in caſe of timely repentance) may they expect, who with thoſe many talents which their Maſter entruſted to them, have aſſiſted and furniſhed the known enemy with arms againſt their Maſter? Conſider what I ſay, and the Lord give you a right underſtanding in all things. Laſtly, I have to entreat the well-affected Reader, not to miſdeem ſome repetitions of the ſame things (in caſes of ſuch conflicts unavoidable) wherein the adverſaries often ſtriking at the ſame parts, requires the ſame or the like wards for defence of the truth: *And now the God of all grace, who hath called us into his eternal glory by Chriſt Jeſus--make you perfect, ſtabliſh, ſtrengthen, ſettle you: To him be glory and dominion for ever and ever.*

AMEN.

A N
Antidote againſt Anabaptiſme:
OR,

Animadverſions on that part of the liberty of *Prophecying* which ſect. 18. pag. 2-3. beareth this Title,

***A particular Conſideration of the opinion of the* ANABAPTISTS:**

— *Their denying Baptiſme to Infants, although it be a Doctrine juſtly condemned by the moſt ſort of Chriſtians, upon great grounds of Reaſon*] Pag. 223. Num. 2.

WE ſay, That denying Baptiſm to Infants, is juſtly condemned by all true Chriſtians; we cannot underſtand them to be ſuch, who renounce their Saviour Chriſt by a pretended Baptiſme in their rebaptizing never warranted by precept, or example in holy Scripture, or thoſe who by their Doctrine annull and make void their Baptiſme by a kind of ſelf-excommunication.

Again we ſay, That to condemne the Doctrine of *Anabaptiſts upon great grounds of Reaſon*, ſeems to lay too narrow a ground, and poſſibly too unſound a foundation for our profeſſion; ſpecially, if we conſider what is here ſaid, Page 165. *Sect.* 10. *Num.* 3. concerning the pretended authority of Reaſon, and *following his guide ſo far as his Reaſon goes along with him, — Or, which is all one, he that follows his own Reaſon, &c. which guidance by Divine Revelation*, and I know not what *other good means* he meaneth, he ſaith, *hath great advantages* —— But to leave ambiguities of words, and confuſion of ſenſes; we affirm, That the word of God is our ground and guide in matters of Faith and Religion (which even the greateſt pretenders to humane authority, and undervaluers of holy Scriptures, do acknowledge in their ſoberer fits) and that the Spirit of God illuminateth the elect whom he calleth, guideth, and enableth to obedience, againſt the dictates of carnall reaſon, and the corrupt affections of fleſh and blood. If he mean any other *Divine Revelation* then that which is conſonant to the known and invariable Rule of Gods word, I know not what greater advantage Satan could deſire for leading beguiled ſouls to hell blindfold, then to find them following their own reaſon, and putting their ſalvations upon pretended revelations; our faith is on Gods truth, not humane Reaſon; which, in this life, is not ſo abſolutely purged from the contagion of ſin, ignorance and error, ſince the Apoſtles being furniſhed with infallibility of Spirit, but that it is ſubject to ſome errors: and therefore though we diſclaim all blind obedience to man in acts of Religion, yet we ſubmit to God in believing every thing which he ſaith; adoring his Truth, which we cannot by any ſtrength of humane Reaſon examine. Moreover we ſay, ſeeing that only may, and can be the ground of our Faith, which cannot erre, or be falſe; and ſeeing that we are *built upon the foundation of the Apoſtles and Prophets, Jeſus Chriſt himſelf being the chief Corner-ſtone*, *Epheſ.* 2. 20. we cannot conſent to be taken off from that infallible certainty, and to be ſet upon the moveable and looſe ſand of onely *Great grounds of Reaſon*, or any thing leſſe known, certain,

——*regula Catholicæ fidei certa, notaq; eſſe debet; nam ſi nota non ſit, regula nobis non erit, ſi certa non ſit, ne regula quidem erit.*

——*quare cum ſacra Scriptura ſit regula credendi certiſſima, tutiſſimaq; ſit, ſanus profectò non erit, qui ea neglecta, ſpiritus interni ſæpe fallacis, & ſemper incert judicio ſe commiſerit, &c.* Bellarm. tom. 1. de verb. Dei, l. 1. c. 2.

--- *fidei non poteſt ſubeſſe aliquod falſum.* 22. q. 1. 3. c. *fides innititur veritati divinæ quæ eſt infallibilis: & ita non poteſt ei ſubeſſe falſum. ib. q.* 4. a. 5. 2.

certain, and infallible then the holy word of God, which we know cannot deceive us.

It will neither be unpleaſant nor unprofitable to draw a ſhort Scheme of plea for each party, the reſult of which poſſibly may be, that though they be deceived, yet they have ſo great excuſe on their ſide, &c.] Page 223. Numb. 2.

Surely unpleaſing to God it is to make ſport with matters of ſo high concernment, and to play with holy things (for ſo this plea muſt be, except you are in earneſt for the Anabaptiſts) or for fear or favour of men, ſo to temporize, as thereby to endanger (as much as you can) the Cauſe and Truth of Chriſt. And how it can be either pleaſing to any good Chriſtian, which diſpleaſeth God, or profitable which cauſeth any to erre from the truth in pleading for that which you acknowledge to be a Doctrine juſtly condemned —— I confeſſe I underſtand not. Poſſibly *Joaſh* would here have replied to ſuch a ſhort Scheme of plea, —— *Will ye plead for Baal?* Judg. 6. 31.

That their error is not impudent or vincible.] See *Joh. Clop. penburg. Gangren. of Anabap. &c.*

To ſay an *impudent error*, is but an ἀκυρολογία, and impropriety of ſpeech, which in more exact expreſſion I ſuppoſe you would render, they are not impudent in defence of their error; If ſo, I onely appeale to experience. As for that which you ſay — *They have ſo great excuſe on their ſide, that their error is not — vincible*, ſeems a contradiction in the *adject*; who believes any error to be invincible, who believeth that *Chriſt* (*the Truth. John* 14. 6.) hath ſufficiently delivered that heavenly light in the Goſpel, which (though God permit it ſometimes to be clowded) ſhall ſhine clear, and the gates of Hell ſhall not prevail againſt it; but it ſhall put to flight and overcome every darkneſs of error, ſpecially in things pernitious, and about the foundation. I ſay not, to the ſenſe of thoſe whom God juſtly giveth over to ſtrong deluſions, that they may periſh who receive not the love of the truth that they might be ſaved; but to the *Goſhen* and *Iſrael* of God, appointed to ſalvation: How elſe ſhould it be, that our faith ſhould be the *Victory that overcometh the world*, except it be in the invincible truth and faith in him 1 Joh. 5. 4.

who hath overcome the world? John 16. 33. For by *World*, Chriſt here meaneth and comprehendeth all that which is contrary to the ſalvation of the Elect, ſpecially thoſe falſehoods and errors, which Satan by any means broacheth to corrupt and overthrow the true Faith. See *Heb.* 11. 1, &c. *Mat.* 16. 8.

Page 223. *The Baptiſme of Infants reſts wholly on this Diſcourſe.*]

If that were true, your plea for *Anabaptiſts* were leſſe condemnable; but the contrary will appeare in due place.

Page 224. Num. 5. *But whether they have originall ſin or no* —]

Indeed the *Pelagians* (an old Sect of *Hereticks*) denied that Infants were born in originall ſin: And *Celeſtius* affirmed, That *Adams* ſin hurt onely himſelf, but not mankind. And others, that Infants are born in the ſame ſtate in which *Adam* was before his tranſgreſſion: But the holy Scripture plainly condemnes this Hereſie. See *Job* 14. 4. *Pſalm* 51. 5. *John* 3. 5. 1 *Cor.* 15 50. *Rom.* 5. 12. 1 *Cor.* 15. 22. *Eph.* 2. 3. So do all the *Reformed Churches*, and Papiſts too, *vid. Bellar. l.* 4. *de amiſſione gratiæ, & ſtat. peccati.* Beſides woful experience teaching us, that children die, demonſtrateth, that they brought that guilt into the world with them which ſubjected them to the ſentence of death, and participation of the puniſhment of *Adams* ſin, which could not be, except they were partakers of his guilt, becauſe God is juſt. That they have contracted the guilt of *Adams* ſin, you confeſſe, pag. 230. *Num* 16.

Proſper de vocat. Gent. lib. 1. *c.* 22. *Negant parvulos trahere originale peccatum omnes qui ſine ullo vitio natos eſſe contendunt.*

Et Celeſtius, &c. Auguſtin tom. 7. *de peccato orig. contra Pelag. & Celeſt. lib.* 2. *c.* 2. *&* 3. *&* 4.

Credimus totam Adami ſoboleм hac contagione infectã, quam peccatum originale vocamus, vitium videlicet ex propagatione trahens non autem ex imitatione duntaxat, ſicut Pelagiani ſenſerunt, &c. Confeſſ. Eccleſ. Gal. Art. 10. 11. *Idem docent omnes reformatarum Eccleſiarum confeſſiones, ut videre eſt* 4. *Sect. Harmoniæ, &c. Andr. Rivet. Sum. Controverſ. q.* 3. *p.* 32.

Cur in Adam omnis homo moritur ſi originalis peccati vinculis non tenetur. Greg. lib. 7. *Epiſt.* 53. *Secundino.*

—*Infants cannot by any act of their own, promote the hope of their own ſalvation, which men of reaſon and choyce may, by acts of vertue and election.* Pag. 225. Num. 6.

Faith and hope of ſalvation are not of our ſelves, but the gift of God, *Eph.* 2. 8. And what hope infants have or acts of reaſon, how God applieth the merit of Chriſt to

Infants,

Infants, who became an infant that he might alſo ſave them; is a ſecret unknown to me: and therefore I do neither anxiouſly enquire, nor raſhly determine.

That men of reaſon and choyce may promote their hope of ſalvation by *acts of Vertue and Election*, muſt cautiouſly be underſtood; ſeeing they neither can do any thing hereto, as they have reaſon or election; both which are naturall, and ſo corrupted, that they are utterly inactive to any moral good, without the help of Gods preventing and quickning grace ſupervenient. The Scripture is expreſſe: *You hath he quickned who were dead in treſpaſſes and ſins,——and were by nature the children of wrath, even as others, &c. It is neither of him that willeth, nor of him that runneth, but of God that ſheweth mercy.*—And where he ſaid, *Work out*, or *finiſh your ſalvation*, — we may not think it dependeth on our works, or of our own ability; for, ſaith he, *it is God which worketh in you both to wil and to do, of his good pleaſure.* Leſt we ſhould think our ſelves excuſed from our uttermoſt endevour, whom he hath made voluntary agents, and in ſome part repaired in our regeneration, he requireth that we *work*, that we receive not that grace in vain, that we ſo run that we may attain; yet that we may not think that this is, or can be by any choice or ability of our own, he telleth us preſently, it is *God which worketh in us*, all which he requireth of us; and ſo good works which follow the juſtified perſon, being fruits of our calling and election, give us a comfortable hope thereof. Yet is it moſt true that God alone according to his abundant mercy (not our merit) hath *begotten us again to a lively hope*, 1 *Pet.* 1. 3. and that *if we do theſe things, we ſhall never fall.*

Eph 2.1,3.

Rom. 9. 16.

Aug. Non autem nisi operatus penderet gratia nostra? Attamen ad juvandum, &c. Bez. in Phil. 2. 12,13.

2 Pet 1.10.

You ſay again, That *God requires nothing on mans part, but that its efficacy be not hindred.*] Pag. 225. Num. 6.

This Propoſition, though plauſible, yet is unſound, as may appear by that which hath been ſaid: to which I add; It is indeed required, that we do not *ponere obicem*, by unbeliefe, impenitency, contempt of Gods ordinance, &c. but he that ſaith, *Ceaſe to do evill*, ſaith alſo, *Learn to do well.* So the Apoſtle exhorteth ——*To give all diligence to make your calling*

Iſa. 1. 16, 17. 2 Pet. 1. 10.

calling and election ſure: for if ye do theſe things ye ſhall never fall. And indeed this is the end of our implantation into Rom. 6. 4. Chriſt by Baptiſm, that we ſhould *walk in newneſs of life*; and no doubt but God requireth of his *Iſrael*, that they ſhould not *quench the Spirit*, or *ponere obicem*, in that he ſaid, *Circumciſe therefore the foreskin of your heart, and harden your necks no more*, *Deut.* 10. 16. Yet he requireth them to *fear the Lord their God, to walk in all his ways,* —— *to keep all the commandements of the Lord* — *v.* 12. 13. And into the ſame covenant are children admitted by baptiſm, which bindeth them on their firſt abilities to perform the ſame, though for the preſent they are no more active then circumciſed Infants were, who were received and ſealed into the preſent covenant of future faith and obedience.

Pag. 226. Num. 6. *Then* (you ſay) *there is a neceſſity that they ſhould be brought to baptiſm, there being an abſolute excluſion of all perſons unbaptized.*]

There is a neceſſity of Baptiſm in reſpect of Gods ordinance, which bindeth us to adminiſter it: but we affirm not ſuch a *neceſſitatem medii*, that all they ſhould be abſolutely excluded from the *Kingdom of Heaven*, who die without baptiſm, as many infants do. That uncharitable opinion we leave to the maintainers therof, we have no warrant ſo to judge: and therefore we ſay, that not the bare privation, but the contempt of the Sacrament condemneth; of which Infants cannot be guilty. So that if you clearly mean a *neceſſitatem medii* in reſpect of the externall miniſtry of man, your Propoſition is not true, nor owned by us: but if you mean a neceſſity in reſpect of our duty in baptizing infants, or their ſpirituall baptiſme by regeneration, we ſo farre conſent; but then we cannot excuſe your *medium* for an *homonomia*, which concludeth not an abſolute excluſion of all perſons unbaptized; is apparently falſ, in the example of the penitent Thiefe, ſaved but not baptized, and in charity to be concluded ſo, in elect children dying before they are baptized: ſo that if our Arguments for baptizing children were no better, you might confidently ſay as you do in the *Epilogue* of your *Plea*, *They have been encouraged in their error*

P. Lombard l. 4 diſt. 1. l.
Concil. Trident. Seſſ. 6. c. 3. & Seſſ. 7. c. 3.
Bellarm. de Sacrament. Baptiſ. l. 1. c. 4.

Pag. 245.

more

more by — our weak arguings, then by any truth of their cauſe, or excellency of their Wit.

You ſay — *Internall* (means of bringing them to an eternall happineſs) *they have none: for grace being an improvement and heightning the faculties of Nature, in order to an heightned and ſupernaturall end, grace hath no influence, or efficacy upon their faculties, who can do no naturall acts of underſtanding* —] Page 226. Num. 8.

What acts of underſtanding elect Infants dying have, I cannot determine, but I am confident all conſidering Readers will abominate and loath this bold and uncharitable cenſure. Who admitted you into the ſecret of Gods councel, concerning the ſtate of Infants, whom either he preſerveth to age, or taketh away before they could be baptized? It is better reſolved, to a worſe end, by your ſelf, p. 231. *Num.* 16. *Many thouſand ways there are by which God can bring any reaſonable ſoul unto himſelf.* — And here in the very next place you affirm, That *God hath made a promiſe of the holy Ghoſt to Infants as well as to men.* — Reconcile theſe two, and your ſelf to your ſelf, if you can. Firſt, you ſay, — *Grace hath no influence or efficacy upon their faculties, who can do no naturall acts of underſtanding*: And next you affirm, that God hath made a *promiſe of the holy Ghoſt to Infants as well as to men.* I demand, Doth God perform every one of his promiſes? Do you mean by the *Holy Ghoſt*, the gifts and graces of Gods holy Spirit regenerating the elect to the Kingdome of Heaven? Can any be ſaved without ſuch grace? can the holy Ghoſt be inactive, and without effectuall influence in any ſoul? Doth God give in his good time, and meaſure, his grace of Regeneration to all the elect, that is, a powerful influence on them to regenerate, ſanctifie, and finally ſave them? Doth God ſave any Infants? Theſe things being concluded on, I would fain learn how it can be true, that children have no internall means of ſalvation: or that Gods Spirit hath *no influence upon their faculties*? Doth the reaſonable ſoul of an Infant expreſs an admirable influence on the bodily faculties, by a naturall inſtinct for its preſervation; and ſhall not the Creator, the Spirit of Almighty God, have much more active

active influence on the ſoul of the elect to ſave it, though there appear none, or very ſlender acts of underſtanding to the judgement and ſenſe of man.

This your Propoſition will appear falſe, if we conſider infants circumciſion; thoſe could do as few acts of underſtanding, as infants now can: neither can any man without high impiety affirm, that Gods grace had no *influence* or *efficacy* on them whom he did not in vain command to be ſealed into his covenant. It is well obſerved by our party, that the Sacraments are not bare reſemblances, or memorials of things paſt, neither naked ſignes or teſtimonies of grace received; but alſo *Canales gratiæ*, whereby God ordinarily deriveth to us thoſe *Rivers of living Water*, *Joh* 7.3. and both delivereth and ſealeth unto us the grace which they repreſent; ſo that theſe holy ſignes are not empty, void of, or without the things ſignified, although the things are received after one manner, and the ſignes after another; one is given by God alone, without the obſervation and knowledge of man, and the other onely by the miniſtry of man, and before men: As at firſt *John Baptiſt* baptized with water, and Chriſt baptized with the holy Ghoſt, though he baptized not with water, but his Diſciples and ſubſtitutes; neither did *John* baptize with the holy Ghoſt, but Chriſt: So is it now, Chriſt baptizeth elect infants by the ſecret influence of his holy Spirit, the fruits whereof appear in their ſeaſon, and his Miniſters, according to his appointment, baptize with water.

Urſin Catech. part. 2. de Bap. Concluſ. 9.

Pag. 228. Num. 12. *To all this* (you ſay) *the Anabaptiſts give a ſoft and gentle anſwer.*]

Sure you do but, herein, *laudando præcipere*, and by ſaying they do ſo, rather ſhew them what they ſhould do, then us, what they do. M. *Fiſher* in his Poſition at the Diſputation at *Aſhford* in *Kent*, ſtiled the maintainers of Pedobaptiſm, *an evill and adulterous generation*. this is one of their ſoft and gentle anſwers. Mr. *Francis Cornwell* in his Sermon at *Crambrook* in *Kent*, called Pedobaptiſm an *Antichriſtian Innovation*, *a humane Tradition &c.* Mr *Cha. Blackwood*, *Title-page*, calleth his Pamphlet againſt us, *The ſtorming of Antichriſt.*

July 27. 1649.

Preface p. 1.

Antichriſt. John Spilsbury calleth Pedobaptiſm, Baptiſm *adminiſtred and received in a falſe Antichriſtian eſtate*, and *by the power of Antichriſt. Edward Barber* calleth it *Antichriſtian and abominable.* And before he ſaith, concerning *Mark* vo. 14. *This place is put in to be read at the ſprinkling of children, for the Whore hath ſweet words, &c.* Is this, as you ſay for your Clients, to give a *ſoft and gentle anſwer?* or a Boyiſh manner of conteſt, to call *Whore*, and all ill names, where they have not other power to prevail? Let all judge who have any ſenſe of humanity, whether this be a *ſoft and gentle anſwer*, to call his mother *Whore*, and the worſt of ſuch, *Antichriſtian*: whereas in ſpight of calumnies, with other reformed Churches, the Church of *England* hath excluded Popery, and what ſhe could, baniſhed that myſticall Whore out of her communion. But this is their Θεὸς ἀπὸ μηχανῆς, to conclude their Scene where they have no evicting reaſon againſt that which they diſlike to pronounce it *Antichriſtian.* And who is ſo ready to caſt this odious Livery upon others, as the moſt Antichriſtian? I might hereto add many more the like inſtances of Railers at Infant-baptiſm, calling it *Idolatrous, of the Dragon and Beaſt*, none other then a ceremony of *Antichriſt, a Satanicall Inſtitution, &c.* but that we have too much of our own at home. It is the quality of the Beaſt to *open his mouth unto blaſphemy againſt God, to blaſpheme his Name and his Tabernacle and them that dwell in Heaven*: But we like not our cauſe the worſe, becauſe ſuch rail at it; but wiſh them to conſider where the Railers place ſhall be, 1 *Cor.*6.10.

J. Spilsbury treat concerning the ſubject of Baptiſm, p.31. Ed. Barber, pag.30. and p.13.

*Deus è machinâ Suid. Eraſm. adag child.*1. *cent.*1.

— *Baptiſmum infantum, eſſe idolatricum* —— *eſſe ex Draconе & Beſtiâ, nec aliud quam ceremoniam Antichriſti. Menno Simonis. f.* 40, 50, *&c. Lucas Sternberg. de quinque Joh. Gerhard. loc. theol. to.*4 *de bapt. fol.*568.

You ſay — *The Argument from Circumciſion is invalid upon infinite Conſiderations.*] Pag.228.Num.13.

It will, I doubt not at laſt prove ſo ſtrong, that neither you, nor any other Advocates ſhall ever be able to over-throw it: for that which circumciſion was in the Old Teſtament, Baptiſm is in the New, which ſucceeded it, and hath the ſame end and uſe, that is, to be a ſeal of the *Righteouſneſſe of Faith*, Rom 4. 11. the ſame Faith in the ſame Chriſt: and therefore the Apoſtle tells the *Coloſſians* that they were *Circumciſed in Chriſt*, — *in that they were buried with him in* Coloſſ 2.11.

Rev.13.6.

Vrſin. quo ſup. *Baptiſm*: ſo that Baptiſm is our Circumciſion, or Sacrament, whereby the ſame things are conferred and confirmed: an in-let for us into the viſible Church of Chriſt, a Seal of the Covenant of Grace, and free remiſſion of ſins by Faith in him into whom it implanteth us. But you ſay,

Rom. 6.

Page 228. Num. 13. *Figures and Types prove nothing, unleſs a Commandement go along with them, or ſome expreſs to ſignifie ſuch to be their purpoſe.*]

We anſwer, 1. "They ſignifie ſomething which is their end; "and the argument *à typo ad veritatem*, holds good from the "ſignes in the Law, to the things ſignified in the Goſpel: as "Children were typically baptized under the law, under the "Cloud, and in the red Sea, 1 *Cor.* 10. 1, &c. and their waſh- "ing with rain from the cloud, prefigured our waſhing in "Baptiſm, and by the Spirit. And the red Sea, in which the "*Ægyptians* were drowned, and *Iſrael* ſaved, was an Em- "blem of Chriſts blood, in which all our ghoſtly enemies "are drowned, and we ſaved.

Dr. Featly, *child. bapt. juſtified. Arg.* 6. *p.* 45. *f.*

2. Here is a meer *ignoratio elenchi*, and miſtake of the queſtion in hand, which is not whether Circumciſion were a type and figure of Baptiſme, but whether Baptiſme ſo ſucceed Circumciſion, as a Seal of the *Righteouſneſſe of Faith*. That ſuch ſorts of perſons (to wit, young and old) within the covenants, as had right to the one, have the like right to the other, which we affirm.

3. Where you ſay, *Unleſs a Commandment go along with them, &c.* Firſt, we ſay, that where the queſtion is miſtaken, we are not in reaſon bound to anſwer untill it be rightly ſtated, and ſo may wave all that you infer concerning the *Deluge* & *Paſchal Lamb*, &c. as meerly impertinent to our preſent controverſie. Secondly, concerning a command for baptizing, you doubt not, nor we for baptizing of Infants; ſeeing that where the Reaſon and Equity of the Law remains, there the Law, for ſubſtance, is ſtill in force, though not for every circumſtance: Now nothing can reaſonably be alledged, why children have leſſe uſe of Reaſon now, then they who then lived, had nnder the Law; or why they ſhould for preſent want of the uſe of reaſon, be now leſſe capable of the

Seal

Seal of the Righteouſneſs of Faith, then they were who lived under the Law? But you ſay further,

—— *Suppoſing a correſpondence of Analogie between Circumciſion and Baptiſm, yet there is no correſpondence of Identitie.* Ib. Pag. 228.

This *Bull* deſerves ſome baiting, were we not treating of ſacred things; therefore I onely ſay, If *correſpondence* import *anſwering unto*, in ſome ſimilitude and likeneſs, there can be no *correſpondence of identity*, for no like is identically the ſame with that to which it is like.

For although it were granted that both of them (Circumciſion and Baptiſm) did conſign the Covenant of Faith.] Ibid.

Speak you this as a matter doubtfull? Is not the Scripture evident? Do you alſo call the truth thereof in queſtion? See *Rom.* 4. 11.

There is nothing in the circumſtance of childrens being circumciſed, that ſo concerns that myſtery, but that it might very well be given to children, and yet baptiſm to men of reaſon.] Ibid.

This Argument is a childiſh caption: We ſay that Baptiſm ſucceeded Circumciſion in ſubſtance, not in circumſtance; in the end and uſe, as hath been ſaid, and whereof we ſhall ſay more anon: To what purpoſe do you argue from the circumſtance? But you ſay, *Fallacia evidentis.*

Circumciſion left a Character in the fleſh, which being imprinted upon Infants, did it work upon them when they came to age?] Ib. Pag. 228.

We anſwer: 1. That the word *Character* may be taken for any ſign, or note diſtinguiſhing one thing from another: ſo Baptiſm may be alſo ſaid to be a character, diſtinguiſhing Chriſtians from unbelievers, not as an abſolute quality, but as a relative thing: as a *teſſera militaris* by which God will own his who fight under the Banner of Chriſt, and by which the baptized have a comfortable aſſurance that they are marked for the children of God when they believe in Chriſt, according as it is written, —— *In whom alſo after that ye believed, ye were ſealed with that holy Spirit of promiſe; which is the earneſt of our Inheritance.* —— 2. Your inſtance importeth onely a

Vox character poteſt accipi pro qualibet nota vel ſigno, rem unam ab aliis diſtinguente, Andr. Rivet. Sum. Controv. tract. 3. q. 6.

Eph. 1. 13, 14.

circumſtantiall, not a ſubſtantiall difference: Now the variety of ſignes vary not the thing ſignified: It is the ſame Chriſt, the ſame Faith, under the Goſpel and under the Law; though the Sacraments by God appointed for the one and for the other, were much different: And the ends of Circumciſion and Baptiſm are the ſame; to implant us into *Chriſts viſible Church*; to be an in-let and door to the ſame; to ſeal up the admitted to faith, repentance, mortification, and newneſs of life: which work is as truly done to the baptized Chriſtian when he cometh to age as it was to the Iſraelite circumciſed, to wit, to and in them that believed and repented; to others the work was ſo farre from being done, that that very ſeal of Gods Covenant which they bare in their fleſh, ſerved for a witneſſe againſt the ſoul of the Covenant-breaker to his greater condemnation: and ſo it is proportionably with the baptized Apoſtate: which may be a warning to your Clients, to repent before it be too late. You ſay again,

Pag. 229 — *It is requiſite that the perſons baptized ſhould be capable of Reaſon, that they may be capable both of the word of the Sacrament, and the impreſs made upon the Spirit.*]

We anſwer: 1. This weakly follows from unſound premiſes; *was there no word added to Circumciſion?* How doth that appear? Was there not a word of Inſtitution? *Geneſ.* 17. 10, 11, 12. Was not the reaſon of the Covenant declared to *Abraham?* Did not he, and others, preach the ſame to all of age to be circumciſed, as Proſelytes, and to the circumciſed infants when they came to age capable of Doctrine? ſo doe we to the baptized: but to perſons of years we preach the Goſpel firſt, and then baptize them; infants we baptize firſt, and inſtruct them when they come to be capable.

See Gen. 18. 19.

2. *That it is requiſite that the perſons baptized ſhould be capable of Reaſon, that they may be capable both of the word, &c.*]

We ſay ſo alſo, they muſt be capable of Reaſon, either in act, that they may preſently underſtand thoſe things; or in habit, that they may afterward underſtand the ſame;

so

to what end elſe ſhould we baptize infants, or why were they circumciſed into future faith, repentance, and newneſs of life? We utterly diſlike Popiſh baptizing of Bels, Churches, Altars, &c. *Durand. rationald.* 1 c. 3. n. 12, &c.

3. We ſay further, That Covenants between man and man, require that both parties expreſsly underſtand & know the tenour, ſubſtance, and particulars of the ſame; but in Covenants between God and his Creatures, that Rule doth not univerſally hold; for here God ſtipulateth and principally tranſacteth with the creature according to that which he will have done, or do in, or by them. So he eſtabliſhed his Covenant with *Noah* and his ſeed after him, and with *every living creature, the Fowle, Cattell, Beaſts, &c. Gen.* 9. 10. How much more rationally may I e make covenant with infants, though yet without the actuall uſe of reaſon? Again, ſometimes ſuch covenants are made between men, as that the parent or parents covenant for, or in ſtead of their children becauſe they are not yet of age to underſtand the words and purport of the covenant, and it ſtandeth good. How much rather may God covenant with an infant, whoſe mouth and Advocate, Chriſt Jeſus, ſaid expreſsly, *Suffer little children to come unto me, and forbid them not, for of ſuch is the Kingdom of Heaven*, Mark 10. 14. Luke 18. 16. I demand, *quo jure*, by what right is the Kingdom of Heaven theirs? What, by deſcent from naturall parents? Nay, but *that which is born of the fleſh, is fleſh*, John 3. 6. And *fleſh and blood cannot inherit the Kingdom of God*, 1 *Cor.* 15. 50. It muſt therefore be by the free covenant of God with them, out of which it can belong to none by right of any infant-innocency, ſeeing all are conceived and born in ſin, the children of wrath, but for the grace and covenant of God with them, which they yet underſtand not, yet is it valid and effectuall to their ſalvation, as we may alſo underſtand in caſe of Circumciſion, in which the circumciſed Child underſtood as little what was ſaid, or done, as the baptized infant now doth, and yet it was Gods covenant with them, *Gen.* 17. 7, 10, 11, 12. and effectual for them. To conclude, if you mean that it is requiſite that none ſhould be admitted to baptiſm, but

Pſal. 51 *Epheſ.* 2

but thoſe that have the actuall uſe of reaſon, that is, men and women of years, you beg the queſtion.

Page 229. ——*of the Sacrament, and the impreſs made upon the Spirit.*]

Concerning a Character or impreſs ſet upon the baptized, the Schoolmen and Jeſuits have moved ſundry queſtions: whether it be an abſolute or relative quality, which yet they ſay, ſticks faſt upon them alſo that are in hell? Whether it be an *ens rationis*, or a *relatio realis*? Whether a quality, action, or paſſion? And if a quality, of what kind it is? Whether the ſubject thereof be the ſoul, or ſome active or paſſive faculty thereof? Whether it be a figure or form? Whether the Sacraments of the old Teſtament made the like impreſs? &c. In all which, and the like vain ſpeculations, we may not unprofitably note the juſt judgment of God, giving them over to unfruitfull deluſions, who forſaking the true and conſtant light of his holy word, give themſelves over to follow the *ignes fatuos* of their own fancies. I hope you are not of their ſenſe, though you mention this impreſs. Concerning the ſeal of our implantation into Chriſt, I have ſpoken a little before; and onely add, that we receive grace, and the obſignation thereof, but are not ſenſible of all, untill we receive a greater meaſure, ——*that we might know the things that are freely given unto us of God.*

1 Cor. 2. 12.

Page 229. *Since therefore* (ſay you) *the reaſon of this parity does wholly fail, there is nothing left to inferre a neceſſity of complying in this circumſtance of age any more then in the other annexes of the type.*]

It wholly holds in ſubſtance for ought you have ſaid to the contrary: and therefore your following inſtances are frivolous. As concerning baptizing the eighth day, we anſwer, 1. That whereas God appointed no ſet day for baptiſm, we have the greater liberty to do it at the moſt convenient ſeaſon, on the firſt, ſecond, third, fourth, &c. or on any day, ſo that we neither contemn Gods ordinance, nor unneceſſarily delay it. 2. As hath been noted, baptiſm ſucceeded circumciſion, not in every circumſtance, but in the thing

Calv. Inſtit. lib. 4. c. 16.

Wiſſn. Cat. part. 2. de Baptiſm.

thing signified, in the end and use. 3. This your argument is a fallacious and childish caption: *à fallacia accidentis*, from the subject to the accident, from the substance to the circumstance, as the learned Dr. *Featly* observeth, such a fallacy is this.

"What the Jews were commanded in the fourth Commandement, that we Christians are bound to perform: But the "Jews were commanded to keep holy the seventh day from "the creation; Therefore we Christians are bound to keep "that day. Such is this *Paralogism*.

Fallacia accidentis est, cum quidvis rei, & accidenti: i. e. *subjecto & ejus attributo, similiter attribuitur.* Arist. l. 1. Elench. c. 4. Dr. Featly child. Bap. justified. pag. 72. m.

If Baptisme succeeded Circumcision, then children ought to be baptized the eight day: it no more followeth, then that children ought to be baptized in the same part where they were circumcised: it will follow rather, "That because "Circumcision was administred to the infant as soon as "it was capable thereof, or could receive the Sacrament "without danger, therefore children ought to be baptized "as soon as conveniently they may. But you say,

The case is clear in the Bishops question to Cyprian, *for why shall not infants be baptized just upon the eighth day, as well as circumcised? If the correspondence of the Rites be an Argument to inferre one circumstance which is impertinent and accidentall to the mysteriousnesse of the Rite, why shall it not inferre all?*]

Non abs re 7. *diem praeteriisse expectabant Judei, quod is* Plutar. *in Problem, & Festo testificantibus, maxime periculosus sit infantibus, si vesentur, nec ante eum terminum, umbilicus resolvatur, ante quem homo proprior est pultæ quam animali, &c.* Poly. Virg. de inven. rer. l. 4. c. 4.

The case is as clear in the Question of *Fidus* the Presbyter, (whom you call *Bishop*) as it is in your objecting it. *Fidus* made a *querie*, or rather affirmed, that Infants ought not to be baptized on the second or third day, but that the law of ancient circumcision ought to be considered; so that he thought

Esse apud omnes, sive infantes, sive majores natu, unam Divini muneris æqualitatem. — nam Deus ut personam non accipit, sic nec ætatem, cum se omnibus ad cœlestis gratiæ consecutionem æqualitate librata præbeat parem — si etiam gravissimis delictoribus, & in Deum multum ante peccantibus, —— & à baptismo atq; gratia nemo prohibetur, quanto magis prohiberi non debet infans, qui recens natus nihil peccavit, nisi quod secundum Adam *— contagium mortis antiquæ prima nativitate contraxit.* Cyprian. l. 3. ep. 8. Fid.

Quantum vero ad causam infantium pertinet, quos dixisti intra secundum vel tertium diem quo nati sunt, constitutos, baptizare non oportere, & considerandam legem esse circumcisionis antiquæ, ut intra octavum diem, eum qui natus est baptizandum & sanctificandum non putares; longe aliud in concilio nostro omnibus visum est. In hoc enim quod tu putabas esse faciendum, nemo consensit: sed universi potius judicavimus, nulli hominum nato, misericordiam Dei & gratiam esse denegandam. Cyprian. q^a. s.

the

but thoſe that have the actuall uſe of reaſon, that is, men and women of years, you beg the queſtion.

Page 229. ——*of the Sacrament, and the impreſs made upon the Spirit.*]

Concerning a Character or impreſs ſet upon the baptized, the Schoolmen and Jeſuits have moved ſundry queſtions: whether it be an abſolute or relative quality, which yet they ſay, ſticks faſt upon them alſo that are in hell? Whether it be an *ens rationis*, or a *relatio realis?* Whether a quality, action, or paſſion? And if a quality, of what kind it is? Whether the ſubject thereof be the ſoul, or ſome active or paſſive faculty thereof? Whether it be a figure or form? Whether the Sacraments of the old Teſtament made the like impreſs? &c. In all which, and the like vain ſpeculations, we may not unprofitably note the juſt judgment of God, giving them over to unfruitfull deluſions, who forſaking the true and conſtant light of his holy word, give themſelves over to follow the *ignes fatuos* of their own fancies. I hope you are not of their ſenſe, though you mention this impreſs. Concerning the ſeal of our implantation into Chriſt, I have ſpoken a little before; and onely add, that we receive grace, and the obſignation thereof, but are not ſenſible of all, untill we receive a greater meaſure, ——*that we might know the things that are freely given unto us of God.*

1 Cor. 2. 12.

Page 229. *Since therefore* (ſay you) *the reaſon of this parity does wholly fail, there is nothing left to inferre a neceſſity of complying in this circumſtance of age any more then in the other annexes of the type.*]

It wholly holds in ſubſtance for ought you have ſaid to the contrary: and therefore your following inſtances are frivolous. As concerning baptizing the eighth day, we anſwer, 1. That whereas God appointed no ſet day for baptiſm, we have the greater liberty to do it at the moſt convenient ſeaſon, on the firſt, ſecond, third, fourth, &c. or on any day, ſo that we neither contemn Gods ordinance, nor unneceſſarily delay it. 2. As hath been noted, baptiſm ſucceeded circumciſion, not in every circumſtance, but in the thing

Calv. Inſtit. lib. 4. c. 16.

Wiſſn. Cat. part. 2. de Baptiſm.

thing ſignified, in the end and uſe. 3. This your argument is a fallacious and childiſh caption: *à fallacia accidentis*, from the ſubject to the accident, from the ſubſtance to the circumſtance, as the learned Dr. *Featly* obſerveth, ſuch a fallacy is this.

Fallacia accidentis eſt, cum quidvis rei, & accidenti: i. e. *ſubjecto & ejus attributo, ſimiliter attribuitur.* Ariſt. l. 1. Elench. c. 4. Dr. Featly child. Bap. juſtified. pag. 72. m.

"What the Jews were commanded in the fourth Commandement, that we Chriſtians are bound to perform: But the Jews were commanded to keep holy the ſeventh day from the creation; Therefore we Chriſtians are bound to keep that day. Such is this *Paralogiſm*.

If Baptiſme ſucceeded Circumciſion, then children ought to be baptized the eight day: it no more followeth, then that children ought to be baptized in the ſame part where they were circumciſed: it will follow rather, "That becauſe "Circumciſion was adminiſtred to the infant as ſoon as "it was capable thereof, or could receive the Sacrament "without danger, therefore children ought to be baptized "as ſoon as conveniently they may. But you ſay,

Non abs re 7. *diem præteriiſſe expectabant Judæi, quod is* Plutar. *in Problem, & Feſto teſtificantibus, maxime periculoſus ſit infantibus, ſi venen tur, nec ante cum terminum, umbilicus reſolvatur, ante quem homo proprior eſt pœnæ quam animali, &c.* Poly. Virg. de inven. rer. l. 4. c. 4.

The caſe is clear in the Biſhops queſtion to Cyprian, *for why ſhall not infants be baptized juſt upon the eighth day, as well as circumciſed? If the correſpondence of the Rites be an Argument to inferre one circumſtance which is impertinent and accidentall to the myſteriouſneſſe of the Rite, why ſhall it not inferre all?*]

The caſe is as clear in the Queſtion of *Fidus* the Presbyter, (whom you call *Biſhop*) as it is in your objecting it. *Fidus* made a *querie*, or rather affirmed, that Infants ought not to be baptized on the ſecond or third day, but that the law of ancient circumciſion ought to be conſidered; ſo that he thought

Eſſe apud omnes, ſive infantes, ſive majores natu, unam Divini muneris æqualitatem. – nam Deus ut perſonam non accipit, ſic nec ætatem, cum ſe omnibus ad cœleſtis gratiæ conſecutionem æqualitate librata præbeat parem — ſi etiam graviſſimis delictoribus, & in Deum multum ante peccantibus, —— & à baptiſmo atq; gratia nemo prohibetur, quanto magis prohiberi non debet infans, qui recens natus nihil peccavit, niſi quod ſecundum Adam — contagium mortis antiquæ prima nativitate contraxit. Cyprian. l. 3. ep. 8. Fid.

Quantum vero ad cauſam infantium pertinet, quos dixiſti intra ſecundum vel tertium diem quo nati ſunt, conſtitutos, baptizare non oportere, & conſiderandam legem eſſe circumciſionis antiquæ, ut intra octavum diem, eum qui natus eſt baptizandum & ſanctificandum non putares; longe aliud in concilio noſtro omnibus viſum eſt. In hoc enim quod tu putabas eſſe faciendum, nemo conſenſit: ſed univerſi potius judicavimus, nulli hominum nato, miſericordiam Dei & gratiam eſſe denegandam. Cyprian. ep. 59.

the

the new-born infant might not be baptized within, or before the eighth day: *Cyprian* answereth: There is one equality of the Divine gift to all, whether they are infants or old men: for as God is no accepter of persons, so neither is he of ages, but he shews himself in an even-ballanced equality, alike to all, as to their attaining heavenly grace — if to grievous offenders, and to those who have before that much sinned against God — and no man is prohibited baptism and grace, how much less ought the infant to be prohibited, who being new-born, hath committed no sin, onely that in *Adam*. — He hath in his first nativity been infected with the contagion of ancient death. But concerning the cause of infants who you say are not to be baptized at two or three dayes old, and that we are to consider the law of ancient circumcision, so that you think that a child born may not be baptized before the eighth day; all that were in our Councell are of a far different judgment; for no man consenteth to that which you thought was to be done: but we all rather judged, that the mercy and grace of God is to be denied to no man born. Let the Reader judge how *clear the case is in the Bishops question to Cyprian*. To the rest of your Arguments we say you dispute *ex non concessis*: We do not say that the *correspondence of Rites* inferre the circumstances, but the substance: but errors are fruitfull, and one absurdity granted, many easily follow. For that you say from your own fancy, which you run away withall.

And then also females must not be baptized, because they were not circumcised.]

We answer, 1. As we have said before, baptism succeeded circumcision not in every circumstance (which your selves justifie in that you baptize women) but in the substance, the thing signified, the end and use: or as others say, in the inward mystery, in the promises, in use, in effects. 2. God expressly restrained circumcision to males, *Gen.* 17. 10, 12, 14. yet the females were comprehended in the males: and to be born of circumcised parents, was to them instead of circumcision, and so were they born to God, and in his account *Daughters of Abraham*, Luke 13. 16. and so within

Calv. Instit. l. 4. c. 16. sect. 20. fin.

within his covenant of grace and mercy: and the ſealing of males was then limited to the eighth day; but now in baptiſm the circumſtances of ſex, age, and a fixed day, are not expreſsly mentioned, but we have a generall commandement to baptize all, without exception to any time, ſex, or age. 3. Though women were not capable of circumciſion, and therefore it was not enjoyned them, yet the female is as capable of baptiſm as the male, and therefore without exception to ſex, they who are all one in Chriſts account, muſt equally be baptized into him. 4. Circumciſion and Baptiſm agreeing in ſubſtance, did yet differ in many circumſtances. Firſt, in the Rite or Ceremony. Secondly, in the manner of ſignifying: For Circumciſion held out grace in the *Meſſias* then to come; but baptiſm preſenteth it in Chriſt exhibited. Thirdly, in the particular teſtimony annexed to make good the promiſe: for then God promiſed, not onely a covenant with his Church, but a peculiar place for the ſame, the land of *Canaan*, untill the coming of the promiſed Seed: but baptiſm hath no particular promiſe of this, or that fixed place. Fourthly, in the manner of binding; Circumciſion did oblige the circumciſed to the obſervation of the whole Law, Morall, Ceremoniall, and Judiciall: but baptiſm bindeth us onely to the obſervation of the Morall Law; that is, faith, repentance, and newneſs of life, according to the holy Rule of Gods will revealed in the Moral Law, from the curſe whereof, in reſpect of non-performance, we are delivered in Chriſt, into whom we are baptized. Fifthly, in their appointed continuance; Circumciſion was appointed onely for *Abrahams* poſterity, and to continue onely unto the coming of Chriſt: but baptiſm was inſtituted for all Nations and times unto the worlds end. Laſtly, in circumſtance of ſex and age, ſo far as circumciſion was limited to males and the eighth day. So that to argue, as you do, from the ſubſtance to the circumſtance, or that which is accidentall, is fallacious, and captious, as hath been ſhewed.

Gal. 5. 3.

Gal. 3. 13.

Gal. 3. 19.
Gal. 5. 2.
Matth. 28. 19, 20.

Fallacia accidentis.

You ſay — *Therefore as Infants were circumciſed, ſo ſpirituall Infants ſhall be baptized* &c.]

This you think a right underſtanding of the buſineſs;

after your ſhuffling together many ſtrange impertinencies, to tell us of baptizing ſpirituall Infants. To which we anſwer: If you mean by *Spirituall Infants*, ſuch as are born again of water and the holy Ghoſt, then you would have them twice regenerate or born: If you mean *Believers* onely, (for in reaſon you cannot call an unbeliever or wicked perſon a ſpirituall infant) then I would fain learn by what diſcerning ſpirit you can know when, and whom to baptize, and whom to put by; or which infant, according to the fleſh, is not a ſpiritual infant, by the ſpirit of regeneration: If you ſay that thoſe who are of years, profeſs faith and repentance, and therefore are to be baptized, it is eaſily rejoined; what ere they profeſſe, they may be hypocrites, and then no more ſpirituall Infants then *Judas* or *Simon Magus* were. If you ſay that in charity you take them for ſpirituall: I anſwer, That an opinion that may be ſo eaſily falſe, and in which any man without ſpeciall revelation may be deceived, is a very unproportionable ground of ſo ſharp a controverſie, as cauſeth your Clients to forſake the Church of Chriſt. Next, I ſay, had you but as much charity towards infants, whom no actuall ſins have yet ſtained, you would as freely judge them ſpirituall infants, and ſo, by your own Principle, to be baptized, as thoſe of years, of whom poſſibly you may know much evill, without all controverſie they have many ſins to be repented of; and why ſhould you not afford harmleſs Infants who cannot diſſemble, as much charity as you do to many hypocrites, of whoſe ſpirituall regeneration, or being ſpirituall Infants, you cannot be certain?

Pag. 229. *And this ſeems to have been the ſenſe of the primitive Church, for in the age next to the Apoſtles, they gave to all baptized perſons milk and honey, to repreſent unto them their duty, that though in age of underſtanding they were men, yet they were babes in Chriſt, and children in malice, &c.*]

Indeed we read of ſuch a cuſtome in *Tertullians* time, but

Inde ſuſcepti, lactis & mellis concordiam præguſtamus. Tertul. de Coronâ mil. c. 3. & ib. adverſ. Marcion. l. 1. c. 14. *Nec mellis & lactis ſocietatem quâ ſuos infantat.* —— *Hæc citat Pol. Virg. l. 4. c. 4. Bucholcer. Ind. Chrono. Anno Chriſti* 208. *Chriſt. Helvici. Theatr. Hiſtor. p.* 91.

that

that was two hundred years after Chriſt: but I find not the ſenſe of the Church therein by him expreſſed to your purpoſe. And *Hierom* mentioneth the ſame cuſtom, but giveth no ſuch ſenſe as you pretend to; it being well known that he was for Infant-baptiſm. And it appears not by any thing you here cite or ſay, that ſuch a cuſtom proveth any thing againſt Baptiſm of Infants, for whom milk and hony is fitter nouriſhment then for the ſtrong, 1 *Corinth.* 3. 2. *Hebr.* 5. 12, 13. Your other conjecture is but feebly grounded; yet you ſay,

Hieron. in Iſai. 55. ——*qui mos ac typus in occidentis Eccleſiis hodie uſq; ſervatur, ut renati in Chriſto vinum, lacq; tribuatur.* Ib. adverſ. Pelag. l. 3.

But to infer the ſenſe of the Pedo-baptiſts is ſo weak a manner of arguing, that Auguſtine, *whoſe device it was (and men uſe to to be in love with their own fancies) at the moſt pretended it but as probable, and a meer conjecture.*]

To which we anſwer, 1. That things which Chriſt commanded to his Apoſtles, could not be *Auguſtines*, or any humane invention, but a divine Inſtitution, ſuch was baptizing of Infants, as will appeare in due place. And this is the ground of this whole controverſie. 2. That it was none of *Auguſtines* device or fancy, with which he was therefore in love, as being his own, *Auguſtine* his ſelf clearly teſtifieth. S. *Cyprian* (ſaith he) not compoſing any new decree, but holding the moſt firm faith of the Church, to correct their error, who thought that an infant might not be baptized before he were eight days old; he, with certain his fellow-Biſhops, was of this ſenſe, that a new-born infant might rightly be baptized. As for the words of *Cyprian*, we have cited them a little before. *Cyprian* with a Conncell of 66. Biſhops, reſolved ſo, not out of any then new-born opinion, or decree, but maintained that which was of old, the firm faith and doctrine of the Church which was long before him: And *Cyprian* flouriſhed about the year of our Lord 222, and was crowned with martyrdom under the perſecuting Emperour *Valerian*, about the year 260. And St. *Auguſtine* flouriſhed

Beatus quidem Cyprianus non aliquod decretū condens novum, ſed Eccleſiæ Fidem firmiſſimam ſervans, *ad corrigendum eos qui putabant ante octavum diem nativitatis, non eſſe parvulum baptizandum——mox natum rite baptizari poſſe, cum ſuis quibuſdam coëpiſcopis cenſuit.* *Auguſtin, Hieron. ep.* 28. *contra Eccleſiæ fundatiſſimum morem nemo ſentiat.* ib.

Hoc Eccleſia ſemper habuit, ſemper tenuit, hoc à majorum fide percepit, hoc uſque in finem perſeveranter cuſtodit. Ib. Aug. de verb. Apoſtlic. Ser. 10.

Cyprian lib. 3. Epiſt. 8.

Buchaner. Ind. Chronol. *Paſſus eſt ſub Valeriano & Galieno principibus perſecutione Octavâ.* Catalog. ſcript. Eccleſ. Hieronym. tom. 1.

Eccleſia ab Apoſtolis traditionem accepit etiam parvulis dare baptiſmum. Orig. com. in Rom.6 Vid.ib. in Levit hom.8 & ib in Luc. hom 14.

about the year 410. and died about the year 430. So that had *Auguſtine* (as you ſay) deviſed it, it muſt have 150 years years before *Auguſtine* was born, been deviſed by *Auguſtine*, which had been a ſingular device indeed. *Origen* of whom you ſay *Auguſtine* had this tradition of Baptizing Infants (*pag.* 237. *N.* 25) ſaith, becauſe we are all conceived and born in ſin, *the Church hath received a Tradition from the Apoſtles to adminiſter Baptiſm to little children.* Now *Origen* lived about the ſame time with *Cyprian.* How you can reconcile your ſelf (in that you here affirm that *Pedobaptiſm* was *Auguſtines* device, and yet confeſſe that *Auguſtine* had it from *Origen*, who died ſo many years before *Auguſtine* was born) I ſay not to the truth, but to your ſelf, I do not underſtand. *Juſtin Martyr*, whom *Tertullian* mentioneth as an Anceſtor (he lived under the Emperour *Antoninus Pius*) and *Irenæus* ſpeaketh of Infants baptized in his time. *Irenæus* ſpeaking of Chriſts Baptiſm and entrance into his publique Miniſtery, ſaith, He ſanctified every age by that ſimilitude which was to himſelf, for he came to ſave all by himſelf; I ſay all, who by him are regenerate to God, infants and little ones, boys, young men and old: therefore paſſed he through every age, for infants he became an infant, ſanctifying infants, &c. This *Irenæus* was ſo ancient, that he ſaw *Polycarp* who was an hearer of ſome of the Apoſtles of Chriſt. It was therefore none of *Auguſtines* device.

Tertul. adverſ. Valentin. c 5. Hieron. Catol ſcript. Eccleſ. Iren l.4 c. 14. Juſt. Martyr. q. ad orth. 56. Omnem ætatem ſanctificans per illam quæ ad ipſum erat ſimilitudinem. Omnes enim venit per ſemetipſum ſalvare. Omnes inquam, qui per eum renaſcuntur in Deum, infantes & parvulos, & pueros, & juvenes, & ſeniores. Ideo per omnem venit ætatem, & infantibus infans factus ſanctificans infantes, &c. Iren. l. 2. c. 39.

3. Whether this be true which you affirm, that *Auguſtine* at the moſt *pretended it but as probable, and a meer conjecture* (to baptize infants, as infants were circumciſed) let *Auguſtine* ſpeak for himſelf (who ſaith) If any man in this thing look for

Polycarpus autem non ſolum ab Apoſtolis edoctus, & converſatus cum multis ex eis, qui dominum noſtrum viderunt. — quem & nos vidimus in primâ noſtrâ ætate, &c. Iren. l 3 c. 3. Vid. Hieronym. Catol. ſcriptor: Eccleſ. Ignat.

Si quiſquam in hac re authoritatem divinam quærat, quanquam quod univerſa tenet Eccleſia, nec conſiliis inſtitutum, ſed ſemper retentum eſt, non niſi authoritate Apoſtolicâ traditum, rectiſſimè creditur tamen veraciter continere poſſumus, quid valeat in parvulis, baptiſmi ſacramentum, ex circumciſione carnis, quam prior populus accepit; quam priuſquam acciperet juſtificatus eſt Abraham ſicut Cornelius etiam dono Spiritus ſancti priuſquam baptizaretur, &c. Cur ergo præceptum eſt, ut omnem deinceps infantulum maſculum octavo die circumcideret, qui nondum poterat corde credere, &c. niſi quia & ipſum per ſeipſum ſacramentum multum valebat? Aug tom. 7. part. 1. de baptiſm. cont. Donat. l. 3 c. 24.

Divine

Divine authority, although that which the universal Church holdeth, being no Decree of any Councell, but hath been always obſerved, that we muſt rightly believe to have been delivered no otherwiſe then by Apoſtolicall authority: yet we may truly apprehend of what value the Sacrament of Baptiſm of Infants may be, from the circumciſion of the fleſh, which the former people received. *Abraham* was juſtified before he received it; as alſo *Cornelius* was endued with the gift of the holy Ghoſt before he was baptized, &c. why therefore was he commanded thenceforth to circumciſe every male child on the eighth day, ſeeing they could not yet believe with the heart? &c. but becauſe the Sacrament it ſelf, is of it ſelf of great moment: ſo untrue is it that *Auguſtine* either deviſed Infant-baptiſm, or ſo ſlightly pretended to it, as you report. But you go on,

And as ill ſucceſſe will they have with their other Argu-ments as with this] Pag. 229. Num. 14.

And what is that for which you cry victory in your former encounters? I will not be ſo expenſive of time, or ſo much entrench upon the Readers patience, as to repeat, let him judge of what he hath read. But what other battalio's come next up? You ſay,

From the action of Chriſts bleſſing Infants, to inferre that they are to be baptized, proves nothing ſo much, as that there is great want of better Arguments.]

A gallant flouriſh indeed: but ſeriouſly; Did Chriſt take them up in his arms, and bleſs them; and are they not bleſſed? Doth not Gods bleſſing give both end and means that we may be ſo? Or ſpake Chriſt onely concerning the carnall ſeed of *Abraham*, and not of the ſpirituall when he ſaid, *Of ſuch is the Kingdom of Heaven?* Surely if Chriſt adjudge and give the Kingdom of heaven (which himſelf onely can give, and in which none but the elect ſhall be) to an infant, it muſt be no leſs then impious in man, to abridge, abjudge, and bar him of admiſſion into the viſible Church of Chriſt by baptiſm, which ſinfull and ignorant man can adminiſter, and which reprobates as wel as the elect may and do receive. But what follows?

The

Pag. 230. *The concluſion would be with more probability derived thus: Chriſt bleſſed children and ſo diſmiſſed them, but baptized them not, therefore infants are not to be baptized.*]

John 4. 1. 'Tis a pretty argument wherein both *Antecedent* and *Conſequent* are lame; 'tis true and granted, that Chriſt in his own perſon baptized them not; but how prove you that he baptized them not by ſome one of his Diſciples? What; becauſe 'tis not written? The Apoſtle may give you ſatisfaction herein, who ſaith, —— *There are alſo many other things which Jeſus did, the which if they ſhould be written every one, I ſuppoſe that even the world it ſelf could not contain the books.* How invalid is the Moderators Agument, *à non ſcripto, ad non factum?* Can there be a ſound concluſion from rotten premiſes? *Chriſt bleſſed children and ſo diſmiſſed them, but baptized them not, therefore Infants are not to be baptized.* —— *Antonii gladios potuit contemnere, ſi ſic omnia dixiſſet.* —— Would it not as well follow *à non ſcripto?* Jeſus granted the Centurions requeſt, and cured his ſervant, and ſo for ought we read diſmiſſed them, but baptized them not, *Mat.* 8. 10, 3. Chriſt healed the ſick of the palſie and diſmiſſed him; but for ought we read baptized him not, *Matth.* 9. 2, 6, 7. *Mark* 2. 23. 5. 11, 12. He healed the woman of the bloody iſſue; but for ought we read baptized her not, *Mat.* 9. 22. *Mark* 5. 34. So the Ruler of the Synagogues daughter, *Matth.* 9. 25. *Mark* 5. 4, 42. So he diſmiſſed the man out of whom he had caſt many Divels, *Luke* 8. 38, 39. we read not that he baptized him. So he pronounced pardon, accepted the repentance, and diſmiſſed the penitent ſinner in peace, *Luke* 7. 50. It were too long to repeat all. So he cured the lame at *Betheſda*, *John* 5. 8. Where (though ſo neer the convenience of water) we read not that he ſo much as once ſpake of Baptiſm to him; neither when finding him in the Temple he ſaid to him, — *thou art healed, ſin no more leſt a worſe thing come unto thee*, can any therefore reaſonably conclude thoſe men and women of years whoſe bodies Chriſt cureth, whoſe repentance he accepteth, whoſe faith his ſelf teſtifieth (who cannot be deceived) were not, and there-

John 20. 3. John 21. 25.

Verſ. 14.

therefore are not (though of years) to be baptized? He that had his time of doing those favours to them, was free to take his time of enjoyning their baptism: And how could you prove that these children were not baptized before or after they were brought to Christ? Before you censure our Arguments as invalid and weak; do your self the right to consider your own.

—— *As we are sure that God hath not commanded Infants to be baptized*] Page 230. Num. 15.

True, God hath not given the command to the Infant himself, but to others whom it concerneth, we are sure he hath: if you mean the first, you trifle; if the second, you do, upon the matter, beg the question.

Quid ego festinat innocens ætas ad remissionem peccatorum, was the question of Tertullian (*lib. de Bapt.*) he knew *no such danger from their originall guilt, as to drive them to a laver, of which in that age of innocence, they had no need, as he conceived.*] Pag. 230. Num. 16.

Whether infants can make haste to baptism, I appeale to experience: Whether they are innocent and have no need of baptism, as *Pelagius* affirmed, I appeal to your own conscience. Do you think there is no danger from infants original guilt which maks them stand in need of the laver of regeneration for the remission of their sin? If you do not, why do you urge against us an authority which your self consenteth not unto? To let pass what *Tertullian* meant when he affirmed such a necessity of baptism, as that he said, *It is prescribed that no man shall be saved without baptism*; which he inferreth from *John* 3. 5. pray teach me what he meant when he said; *Man from his beginning circumvented, so as that he would transgress Gods command, therfore was condemned to death, whereby he also made all mankind, being infected from his seed, a traduction* (or derivation from one to another) *of his own damnation*: Think you damnation no danger? or did not *Tertullian* know what he wrote? How he forgat himself and the truth when he would have children come to Christ onely then when they could learn and know Christ, whereas Christ said, *Suffer little children to come unto me, and forbid*

Præscribitur nemini sine baptismo competere salutem —— *homo à primordio circumventus ut præceptum Dei excederet, & propterea in mortem datus exinde totum genus de suo semine infectum, suæ etiam damnationis traducem fecit.* Tertul. de Test. anim. c. 3. Tertul. de Bapt. c. 18.

Mark 10. 14.

bid them not; I can give no better account, then for other his errors; onely let the Reader note, that in the ſame place he affirmeth, that the *unmarried* alſo are to be deferred, and not baptized untill they are married, or ſetled in continency; but I ſpare this: We look for truth, and ſhall be glad to own and embrace it, in what Author ſoever we find it; but againſt the truth we are bound to none: onely we may note, that if *Tertullian* ſpake in the fore-cited place concerning Infants, that Pedobaptiſme was in his time in uſe in the Church; and ſo it muſt appear moſt falſe, which you before ſaid, that it was *Auguſtines* device.

Non minore de cauſâ innupti quoq; procraſtinandi. Tertul. q. ſup.

Pag. 229. *What need all this ſtirre? As infants without their own conſent, without any act of their own, and without any exterior ſolemnity, contracted the guilt of* Adams *ſin, and ſo are liable to all the puniſhment which can with juſtice deſcend upon his poſterity, who are perſonally innocent, ſo infants ſhall be reſtored without any ſolemnity, or act of their own, &c.*

What need this ſtirre you make to trouble the peace of Chriſts Church? Why trouble you your ſelf with our ſtir to do that which Chriſt commandeth us? Shall we ſuffer the Wolf quietly to take away ſheep from Chriſts flock (as we daily ſee by the ſleepy cowardize and dangerous ſilence of ſome temporizing Paſtors, who poſſibly have learned from that old Courtier *Criſpus* ——

——*qui nunquam direxit brachia contra torrentem*) nay, but we know there is a dangerous ſilence. See *Ezek.* 3. 18. *Eſter* 4. 14. But to the matter, we ſay, that as in *Adam* all die, ſo in Chriſt ſhall all be made alive, 1 *Cor.* 15. 22. which being reſtrained according to the Apoſtles intention, to the faithfull and elect, might reaſonably conclude, that as all men, even the faithfull and elect, were by naturall propagation condemnable in *Adam*, God juſtly imputing to his whole poſterity that his act, whereby he not onely made his own perſon guilty, but alſo corrupted his nature: ſo are they by regeneration ſaved in Chriſt, God mercifully imputing his merits to them for their juſtification: ſo that, as they were condemnable for that they did not in their

their own perſons commit, ſo ſhall they be ſaved by that which Chriſt, not they, did freely without the works of the Law: but of what conſequence is ſolemnity? Would you have our fall in *Adam*, and repair in Chriſt run literally parallell, even to circumſtances? But what manner of arguing this were, we have often ſaid. How many ridiculous conſequences would you thence inferre? concerning a man, a woman, and a Serpent, and no more in the Scene: a garden, a fruit, &c. But remembring that we are ſpeaking of ſacred things, we reſolve, that a Sacrament which is inſtituted of God to this end, that it may be a ſolemn receiving into the Church, and a ſevering, or ſign of diſtinguiſhing the whole Church, & all her parts, from all other Sects, ought to be miniſtred ſolemnly, that others may take notice of the ſame, and that it may be the ſtricter bond to the baptized when they come to years, to hold them into faith, obedience, renunciation of the world, impious deſires, and carnall affections, into which condition they were ſolemnly, and before many witneſſes admitted by baptiſm. *Urſin. Catech.*

And it is (you ſay) *too narrow a conception of God Almighty, becauſe he hath tied us to the obſervation of the Ceremonies of his own inſtitution, that therefore he hath tied himſelf to it.*] Pag. 231.

We never had that conceit, you miſtake the matter: we ſay not that God is tied to his own Ordinances, as if he could no otherwiſe ſave any, but that we are tied to Gods Ordinances, becauſe they are the revealed will of God, which man is bound to obey. And though God be the moſt free Agent, and not tied, yet it doth not hence follow, that baptiſm is not the ordinary means of regeneration, to which we are tied. God hath not in your ſenſe tied himſelf to the baptiſm of perſons in years, as may appear in the penitent thief, who unbaptized was ſaved, *Luke* 23. 43. It is ſo in his other ordinances.—— *It pleaſed God by the fooliſhneſs of preaching, to ſave them that believe*, 1 *Cor.* 1. 21.] Therefore ordinarily faith is by hearing the word, *Rom.* 10. 17. yet God hath not ſo abſolutely tied it to preaching, but that he could at his pleaſure convert *Saul* breathing threatnings,

——*Interim tamen ex eo non poteſt inferri baptiſmum non eſſe ordinarium regenerationis medium ad cujus uſum adhibendi ſumus.* Joh. Gerhard. de Baptiſm. Sect. 2. claſſ. 2.

Acts 9. Neither is he tied to the *Euchariſt*: would you conclude hence that men and women of years are not tied to be baptized, hear the word, or receive the Lords Supper, becauſe God, and his free grace are not tied to theſe externall and ordinary means? If not, what meaneth that your *medium* (*God hath not tied himſelf*) and what can it more conclude againſt Infants baptiſm, then againſt the baptiſm, hearing, receiving the *Euchariſt* by perſons of years?

Yet we affirm, that when God made the promiſe to *Abraham*, being willing more abundantly to ſhew to the heirs of promiſe the immutability of his councell, *confirmed it by an oath, that by two immutable things, in which it was impoſſible for God to lie, we might have a ſtrong conſolation, &c. Heb. 6.* 17, 18. In which ſenſe, God hath bound himſelfe to make good to us, all that which the Seals of his Covenant by himſelf appointed, hold forth unto us. But you add,

Many thouſand ways there are by which God can bring any reaſonable ſoul to himſelf.]

Incluſio unius non eſt excluſio alterius. Gerh. 9° s. ſect. 3. n. 188 *fin.*

We anſwer: The admitting of the one is not always the excluding of all other: and we queſtion not Gods power herein, but his will; here is an *Ignoratio elenchi.* What think you of the validity of that Argument which is from Gods power to his will? He can open the eys of the blind, and convert the hearts of temporizers, and profeſſed enemies of his Church and Truth, I would I were aſſured that he would now do ſo.

But (you ſay) *nothing is more unreaſonable, then becauſe he hath tied all men of years and diſcretion to this way, therefore we of our own heads ſhal carry infants to him that way without his direction.*

Here is again a fallacious arguing: You take the thing in queſtion for your *medium*: The queſtion is, Whether baptiſm of Infants be a divine or humane inſtitution, upon which dependeth wholly whether we ought or ought not to baptize Infants? Now you would prove that we ought not to carry infants to Chriſt by baptiſm, becauſe he appointed or directed us not ſo to do; but (as you ſay) we do it of our own heads: Nay, but confining ſacramentall adminiſtrations to ſuch time, age or other circumſtance, by Chriſt never limited

limited or enjoyned, is will-worſhip, and mans invention. This your conceit is ſo poor and low, that a puny Sophiſter would be aſhamed of it.

Onely this (you ſay) *that God hath as great a care of Infants, as of others, &c.*] Page 231. Num. 17.

Here is another argument as feeble as the fore-going: What? becauſe God hath as great a care of them as of others, therefore we muſt have no care of them in the application of the ordinary means? ſo hath he a care for their bodily preſervation and ſuſtenance; doth that prove that we ought not to feed or cloath them? God reſpectively careth for all the Creatures, *he giveth to the beaſt his food, Pſal.* 147. 9. Were it good *Georgicks* to ſay, Trouble not your ſelf to fodder your cattle, or looſe them from their ſtall that they may drink? Who knoweth not that God hath appointed ordinary means, although he can do it without ſuch means. and though he ſay not that he will not otherwiſe preſerve them, but leave them to the dictates of common reaſon to conclude? Mat. 6. 26, 28.

—*God* (you ſay) *will by his own immediate mercy bring them thither where he hath intended them; but to ſay that therefore he will do it by an externall act and miniſtery, — is no good Argument, &c.*]

Prove that one Aſſertion, That God will by his own immediate mercy ſave Infants, and have no means uſed thereto, and you have the Cauſe: but Chriſt hath appointed baptiſm for the ordinary means to bring people into his viſible Church, that they may be ſaved: that he doth otherwiſe, that is, by an immediate act of mercy ſave ſome, to whom his all-diſpoſing providence hath not given time or means, as in Infants dying before they were or could be baptized; this varieth not the Rule, for our queſtion is not concerning them, and to ſay that therfore *he will do it by an external act*, becauſe he will ſave them, or bring them thither whither he hath intended them, *by his own immediate mercy*, *is no good Argument*, you may lay your life on't. *Immediatly* ſignifieth without means, ſo that *Immediately* by means is a contradiction in the adject: this were to my ſenſe ſo farre from a

good argument, that I ſhould doubt whether ſuch a Diſputant were awake, or not: Immediatly by an external act and miniſtery? none of ours ever ſo reaſoned.

And why cannot God as well do his mercies to infants now immediatly, as he did before the inſtitution either of circumciſion or baptiſm?

Once again we ſay, We queſtion not Gods power: truly nor his will in many Infants dying before they could be baptized: the queſtion is, whether we may or ought, according to Gods revealed will, baptize them? In which it ſeemeth to us a very weak *querie, And why cannot God as well do his mercies to Infants now immediately? &c.*]

Pag. 231. Num. 18.

However (you ſay) *there is no danger that Infants ſhould periſh for want of this externall miniſtery, &c.*]

Not to diſpute Gods ſecret counſels, we ſay, the danger will be to the deſpiſer and neglecter of Gods Ordinance; wherein *Tertullians* Aſſertion may ſerve for a reaſon: *Becauſe* (ſaith he) *he ſhall be guilty of a mans deſtruction, who ſhall omit to do that which he freely might have performed.*

Quoniam reus erit perditi hominis, ſi ſupersederit præſtare, quod liberè potuit. Tertul. de bapt. c. 12.

For (ſay you) *Water and the Spirit in this place* (John 3. 5.) *ſignifie the ſame thing; and by water is meant the effect of the Spirit, cleanſing and purifying the ſoul &c.*]

It is true that *Calvin*, *Oecolampadius*, and ſome others, do not think that Chriſt doth there preciſely ſpeak of Baptiſm, but that he either oppoſed it to Phariſaicall waſhings and purifications; to which poſſibly *Nicodemus*, with whom he then diſcourſed, might be too much addicted: Or, that thoſe words are ſimply to be interpreted concerning Regeneration; but *Juſtin Martyr*, *Chryſoſtome*, *Theophilact*, *Cyril*, *Euthymius*, *Auguſtine*, *Rupertus*, *Bonaventure*, *Muſculus*, *B Aretius*, *R. Rolloc*, *Pelargus*, and others expound theſe words concerning Baptiſm, the Sacrament of Regeneration; the preſent ſpeech of Chriſt being concerning Regeneration: and

Juſt. Mart. Apol. 2. Ambroſ de Abrahm. l. 2 c. 11. & ib. 63. 84. lib. 10

and it is moſt probable that Chriſt therein reſpected the common order of the Church, mentioning the Spirit and Water; to ſhew that we muſt be baptized if we will be ſaved; yet 'tis not the water but Gods holy Spirit which waſheth away our ſins: Neither doth he ſo ſimply and neceſſarily tie the grace and efficacy of Gods Spirit to the Sacrament of Baptiſm, as if none could be ſaved without Baptiſm, and that God could not extraordinarily and immediately ſave. Whatſoever Papiſts ſay to the contrary to aſſert their bloody decree and cruell doctrine concerning Infants dying without Baptiſm: yet their Schoolmen, and they, in their more ſober fits, confeſſe, that God hath not abſolutely tied his grace to the Sacraments. Chriſt ſaith, *He that ſhall believe and be baptized, ſhall be ſaved*; but in the Antitheſis he ſaith not, Whoſoever ſhall not be baptized, ſhall not be ſaved; to ſhew us, that faith alone may ſometime be ſufficient to ſalvation, as in the penitent Thief; but nothing can ſuffice without faith; becauſe without it, it is impoſſible to pleaſe God. And becauſe faith onely apprehendeth Chriſt, in whom alone there is ſalvation, *Acts* 4. 12. To conclude, it doth not appear, that Water and the Spirit in the fore-cited place, *John* 3. 5. ſignifie one and the ſame thing. Although Chriſts Baptiſme with the Spirit, (which gives the effect of Baptiſm) were more excellent then *John Baptiſts*, or any Miniſters of the Goſpel: for ſo is it ſtill, and yet no ſober man will deny, that the water in baptiſm and the Spirit, do differ, as the externall ſign and inward grace thereby ſignified. You ſay further,

Sic accipienda, eſt, &c. ut reſpexerit communem Eccleſiæ ordinẽ, neq; tamen ſimpliciter gratiam Dei adſtrixerit ſacramento, quaſi ſit abſolutè & ſine exceptione neceſſarium, Beza in Joh. 3. 5.

Deus non alligavit gratiam ſuam ſacramentis.

Ipſe (Chriſtus) potuit effectum ſacramentorum ſine exteriore ſacramento conferre. Aquin. 3ª 4. 64 a. 3. c.

— *Deus qui ſuam potentiam ſacramentis non alligavit.* P. Lombard. *l.* 4. diſtinct. 4. E. *Mark* 16. 16.

–Cautè & vigilanter non repetierit (qui verò baptizatus non fuerit) ſed tantùm, qui verò non crediderit condemnabitur nimirum innixens ſolum interdum fidem ſufficere ad ſalutem, & ſine ipſa, ſufficere nihil. Bernard. Ep. 77.

——— *You may as well conclude, that infants muſt alſo paſſe through the fire, as through the water, &c.*]

This aſſertion might better have ſuited with the dream of ſome fanaticall *Jacobite*: What will not ſuch an advocate ſay for his Clients? I appeal to your own conſcience, may we as well conclude againſt Gods word, as for it? God expreſsly

Jacobitæ non aquam ſed ignem materiam baptiſmi aſſerebant.

preſsly ſaith, *Deut.* 18. 10. *There ſhall not be found among you any one that maketh his ſon or his daughter to paſſe through the fire*; and it is above all rationall controverſie, that he inſtituted baptizing with water, who ſaid, *Baptize all Nations*, without any exception at all to infants: this is *a poor trick* of yours to elude Scripture: And where doth *Peter ſay the ſame thing*, that *we may as well conclude that infants muſt alſo paſs through the fire, as through the water?* No, no, *Peter* by the Spirit of truth ſpeaketh another thing, indeed intimating by thoſe words, 1 *Pet.* 3. 2. *Not the waſhing of the fleſh, but the confidence* (as we tranſlate, *but the anſwer*) *of a good conſcience toward God* — the effects of the inward baptiſm; which the *Syriac* in his *Paraphraſticall* interpretation of that place, maketh more clear, *but confeſſing God in a pure conſcience*: as when in the peace thereof we call upon him with an holy ſecurity of his hearing us, which can be onely in the inward Baptiſm, which the Spirit of *Jeſus* giveth by faith and ſanctification, wherein we have peace toward God in the aſſurance of our juſtification, *Rom.* 5. 1. *Rom.* 8. 15, 16. So that the ſum is, that the outward ſign, the water and waſhing of the body in baptiſm, is not ſufficient to ſalvation, if the Spirit of *Jeſus* give not the inward effect thereof; and therefore it is dangerous to live ſecurely in ſin and unbelief, as too many do, in vain confidence that they muſt needs be ſaved, becauſe they have been baptized into the viſible Church of *Chriſt*: No, but the externall ſign availeth not where the inward grace thereby ſignified is wanting. So in the preaching of the Goſpel, & adminiſtration of the holy *Euchariſt*, mans miniſtery can nothing prevail to the receivers ſalvation, without *Gods Spirit* giving the inward effect: ſo that *Peter* briefly toucheth the power & uſe of baptiſm, recalling us to the teſtimony of a good conſcience, & that confidence therein which can endure the ſight of God and his Tribunal, and flye unto him in all wants through Chriſt. But this Scripture is fanatically perverted by *Schuincfeld* & others, who would hence cōclude againſt the effect of the Sacrament in the elect, whereas the Apoſtle affirmeth not, that the inſtitution of Chriſt for baptizing the body with water, is vain or effectleſs; but ſecretly

συνειδήσεως ἀγαθῆς ἐπερώτημα εἰς θεὸν —

Sed confitentes Deum in conſcientiâ purâ. Tremel.

cretly admoniſheth carnall Goſpellers, that they reſt not in their ſecurity, but conſult their own conſciences, whether they find there the effect of their baptiſm: ſo that he neither ſaith, that infants may *as well paſs through the fire as through the water*, as you trifle; nor is this place any thing to the purpoſe in this queſtion of Infant-baptiſm: ſo that your following confuſed *Hypotheſes* are of no value or uſe, except to puzzle the Reader to find out what you mean, which he hardly ſhall: Therefore when you expreſs your ſelf more orderly and clearly, we owe you an Anſwer.

This (you ſay) *no more inferres a neceſſity of Infants Baptiſm, then the other words of Chriſt inferre a neceſſity to give them the holy Communion*, Niſi comederitis carnem filii hominis, &c.]

This is another argument of Anabaptiſts *à pari*: if infants (ſay they) are to be baptized, they are alſo to be admitted to the Lords Supper. But in this agument there is a *Sophiſma elenchi*: for firſt it wants the condition ὁμοίως; if we follow your ſenſe concerning ſpirituall infants, taking infants for ſpirituall or regenerate perſons in the *major*, and for thoſe who are literally infants in the *minor*: and it wanteth alſo ἐν τῷ αὐτῷ χρόνῳ. There is no queſtion but that baptized infants have right to the holy Cõmunion, as they have to ſtrong meat, but not a capacity as ſuch, or while they are infants: and God hath in expreſs terms reſtrained the Lords ſupper to thoſe who can actually apprehend, remember, & declare forth Chriſts death, 1 *Cor.* 11.26. which becauſe infants cannot do, we give them not the Communion. Secondly, God hath denounced a grievous curſe, or puniſhment againſt any that ſhall preſume without due examination of himſelf, to eat of that bread & drink of that cup: but not ſo concerning Baptiſm, it being the ſeal of our new-birth and reception into the viſible Church and Covenant, which hath no ſuch condition annexed, as may juſtly exclude Infants in reſpect of any preſent *non-performance* thereof. But the Lords Supper is the Seal of our growth in grace, and ſpirituall ſtrength, inſtituted for the confirmation of our admittance into, and our continuance in the Church of Chriſt, whoſe

Pag. 229.

whoſe death and paſſion for our redemption, we thereby ſhew forth and commemorate, for our ſpirituall perfection, nouriſhment, and ſtrengthening in faith and other graces of his Spirit, for our aſſurance, that God having once received us into his favour, will continue his mercy to us in Chriſt: By theſe diſparities the invalidity of the *Pleaders* Argument may appear. And if it were true which he further ſaith, that *the Wit of man is not able to ſhew a diſparity in the ſanction, &c.* yet the wiſdom of God is able, and hath declared this difference in holy Scripture; and the ſame can ſhew more then the wit of man can diſcern, and hath ſhewed more then the learned Pleader doth, or will underſtand, who I conceive, doth not yet know all that *the Wit of man*, or *all the world* can inform him of; but is it not better even for thoſe who have been in the Mount with God, to caſt the veil of modeſt humility over thoſe excellencies which they have received, and with which they ſhine to others admiration, then to oſtent them to the contempt of others? The *Apoſtle* of *Chriſt* was rap't up into the third Heaven, and yet profeſſed — *we know in part, and we propheſie in part,* — 1 *Cor.*13.9.

Se more hereof, Mr. *Cobbet* explic. Luke 18.15. Page 121, 122. Init.

2 Cor.12.2.

But you further ſay, —— *Since the ancient Church did with an equall opinion of neceſſity, give them the Communion, &c.*]

That which you ſaid a little before, — *They are as honeſt and as reaſonable that doe neither*, to wit, baptize infants, or give them the Comunion, as thoſe that underſtood the *Obligation to be Parallel*, we may very well believe and wiſh, that either of them may prove honeſt hereafter. But to that which you ſay, That *the ancient Church did with an equall opinion of neceſſity give them the Communion*, I anſwer, 1. with *Tertullian*, That is of the Lord and true, which was firſt delivered; but that is extraneous and falſe which is afterward received in. And with *Cyprian*, We ought not to heed

Id eſſe Dominicum & verum quod ſit prius traditum: id autem extraneum & falſum quod ſit poſterius immiſſum. Tertul. de Præſcript. c. 31.

Non debemus attendere, quid aliquis ante nos faciendum putaverit; ſed quid qui ante omnes eſt Chriſtus fecerit: neque enim hominis conſuetudinem ſequi oportet, ſed Dei veritatem. Cypr. l. 2. Ep. 3.

heed what ſome before us have thought was to be done; but what *Chriſt did*, who was before all: for we ought not to follow the cuſtom of men, but the truth of God. 2 Your own rule muſt binde you, (though it cannot others who conſent not thereto) *they who reject tradition when 'tis againſt them, muſt not pretend it at all for them*, pag. 237. *Numb.* 25. 3 It is conſiderable in that cuſtome of the church, as ſome other incoveniences, which *Auguſtine* ſaith, It is (ſaith he) one thing which we teach, and another which we endure; one thing which we are enjoyned to command, and another thing which we are commanded to amend; and untill we amend, we are compelled to endure it. And again, who is eaten with the zeal of Gods houſe? why, he that endeavoureth and deſireth to amend all that he ſees amiſſe; he reſteth not; if he cannot amend it, he endureth it, he ſigh's: the grain is not toſſed out of the floor; it endures the chaff, that it may enter into the granary when the chaff is winnowed out. 4 We adhere not ſo to tradition, that we univerſally receive all that which was done or ſaid of old: things delivered by ſome, but not generally received by the Church, we eſteem but ſuperſtructions of particular men, or ſuperſeminations, which poſſibly may ſpread farre, as many pernicious opinions have done; yet no ſober man ever took them for *Apoſtolicall*, or ſo much as *Eccleſiaſticall* traditions: we neither reject any tradition which appeareth to be *Apoſtolicall* (if not peculiar to their times, or ſuited peculiarly to certain times, places, or perſons) nor do we raſhly receive any tradition for ſuch, except we are certain that the Scripture determineth nothing againſt it, or where ſtrong conſequence from thence juſtifieth it. 5 We conceive *Auguſtines* rule herein to be good: *In thoſe things (ſaith he) concerning which divine Scripture determineth nothing certainly, the cuſtome of Gods people, or inſtitution of our anceſtors are to be held for a law — otherwiſe, endleſſe contention will ariſe* — alſo we muſt beware that the calm of charity be not clouded by the ſtorm of contention. 6 We will not raſhly diſſent from reverend

Aliud eſt quod docemus, aliud quod ſuſtinemus: aliud quod præcipere jubemur; aliud quod emendare præcipimur, & dum non emendamus, tolerare compellimur. To. 6. contr. Fauſt. Manich. l. 20. c. 21. *Quis cogitat zelo domus Dei? qui omnia quæ forte ubi vidit perverſa ſatagit emendare, cupit corrigere, non quieſcit, ſi emendare non poteſt, tolerat, gemit: non excutitur de aréâ granum: ſuſtinet paleam, ut intret in horreum cum palea fuerit ſeparata.* Aug. tract. 10. in Joh. 2. *In his enim rebus de quibus nihil certi ſtatuit Scriptura divina, mos populi Dei, vel inſtituta majorum, pro lege tenenda ſunt. — evitetur interminata luſtratio — utique cavendum eſt ne tempeſtate contentionis ſerenitas charitatis obnubiletur.* Aug. Caſulano ep. 86.

antiquity, wherein it diſſenteth not from the truth: we love peace with all who hold that in fundamentalls at leaſt, and therefore will follow *Auguſtin's* advice, in that he piouſly ſaith concerning his reader —*where* (ſaith he) *he knows his errour, let him return to me; where mine, let him recall me*: our rule being, that of the *Apoſtle*, 1 *Cor.* 11 1. *be yee followers of me, even as I alſo am of Chriſt*: more no good man will require, nor render leſſe to *Anceſtors*. 7 Laſtly we ſay that the Scripture which you cite, *Joh.*6.53. *except ye eat the fleſh of the Son of man, and drink his blood, you have no life in you*; is not ſpoken concerning a Sacramentall, but a ſpirituall feeding; and although * ſome of the *Jeſuites* and other *Papiſts* contend againſt us herein, yet || ſome of the moſt ſober of them acknowledge that thoſe words are not to be underſtood concerning eating or receiving the Lords ſuper; which ours generally maintain: you might do your ſelf right to joyn with us, and not with the moſt eager *Jeſuites* concerning the ſpirituall feeding of infants to eternall life by the merit of Chriſt applyed to them for their Union with him, and ſalvation in and by him, we willingly accord: the manner of effecting by the ſecret power of the holy Ghoſt, we enquire not after, becauſe it is not revealed; but for the reaſons alleaged, we give them not the communion.

Ubi errorem ſuum cognoſcit, redeat ad me; ubi meum, revocet me, &c. Aug. *de trin.* l. 1. c. 2.

* *Bellarm. de ſacr.* Euch. *l.* 1. c. 5. 7. *ib. l.* 2. c. 8. *ib. l.* 4. c. 25. *Coſter Enchirid. de Euchariſt.* Sacr. 7. Suares. *diſp.* p. 45. Sec. 2. *Maldon in* Joh. 6. *Gabr. Vaſquez. diſp.* 179. c. 4.

|| *Aquin.* 3a. q. 65. a. 4. 2m. *dicit illud--eſt* Diſt. 9. A. B. *intelligendum de ſpirituali manducatione. Sic* Pet. Lombard. *diſt.* 8. D. *Janſenius concord. Evang.* c. 59. *Dan. Chamier Panſtrat.* To. 4. *l.* 11. c. 3. 4.

Next you ſay —*If Anabaptiſt ſhall be a name of diſgrace, why ſhall not ſome other name be invented for them that deny to communicate infants, which ſhall be equally diſgracefull, &c?*]

That would be a rare invention indeed: but if to call *Anabaptiſts Anabaptiſts*, be juſt, why find you fault with it? if evill or unjuſt, why conſult you how to imitate it by way of revenge? is it not a ſhame to be ſuch, as we are or may well be aſhamed to be called? truely we allow not any diſgracefull name or reviling; but know that the name injureth not where the thing it ſelf is not diſgraceful: ſome name we muſt diſtinguiſh them by: if you can invent a more true and proper one, we ſhall be beholding to you for an invention, and they for a new name. Next you ſay,

That

That the diſcourſe of S. Peter, which is pretended for the intitling infants to the promiſe of the holy Ghoſt, and by conſequence to baptiſme, which is ſuppoſed to be its inſtrument and conveyance, is wholly a fancy, and hath in it nothing of certainty or demonſtration, and not much probability.] Pag. 233. Num. 19.

We anſwer: your words carry a dangerous ſhew of blaſphemy, but we deſire to allow them the faireſt interpretation which can be made of them, and ſuppoſe you meant not to ſay (as the connexion of your words imports) that *S. Peters* diſcourſe is wholly a fancy, &c. but either that the pretence from theſe words intitling *infants to the promiſe of the holy Ghoſt, and ſo by conſequence to baptiſme*, or as you after affirme, *that baptiſme is not the meanes of conveying the holy Ghoſt*, Pag. 234 ſome of theſe you take to be *wholly a fancy*. To which we reply; that we neither affirme, nor conceive that theſe words of *S. Peter* had a promiſe for infants as ſuch, to receive the extraordinary, and viſible gifts of the holy Ghoſt which then flouriſhed in the primitive Church, and which men of yeares commonly after baptiſme then received; but that promiſe was for preſent addreſſed to *S. Peters* hearers which were *prickt in their hearts and ſaid unto Peter and the reſt of the Apoſtles, men and brethren what ſhall We doe?* and to whom *Peter* ſaid, *repent and be baptiſed every one of you*, &c. to which he encourageth them by three arguments or motives: firſt from Gods abundant mercy in the remiſſion of their ſins, however grievous. Secondly from his gracious benificence, as well in giving, as forgiving, *and ye ſhall receive the gifts*, &c. for your confirmation. Thirdly from the extent of Gods federall promiſe; *for the promiſe is to you and your children:* that promiſe is recorded *Gen.* 17. 7. *I will eſtabliſh my covenant between me and thee, and thy ſeed after thee, to be a God unto thee and thy ſeed after thee*, &c. theſe words *S. Peter* relateth to, when he perſwaded them to receive baptiſme the ſeal of Gods new covenant with them in Chriſt, a ſeal of the ſame righteouſneſſe of faith in Chriſt; and he bringeth down infants right to the ſeal of the covenant with *Abrahams* carnall ſeed (that is, circumciſion) to their right to the ſeal of the covenant with his ſpirituall ſeed under the goſpel, that is Rom. 4. 11.

baptiſme for the remiſſion of ſins: ſo that if *S. Peters* argument may paſſe with you for demonſtration, and not be miſtaken for a *fancy*, this ſhew's the right and title which infants have to baptiſme, grounded on the ſure promiſe of God, which the *Apoſtle* well knew was firſt ſealed with infant-circumciſion, as well as circumciſion of proſelyted men of yeares; and therefore applyeth it to the ſeal of the promiſe under the goſpel, to wit baptiſme: *Be baptized every one of you:* who? all thoſe to whom the promiſe of God is: that is, *you and your children*, for the promiſe is to you and them. But you ſay,

This is a promiſe that concerneth them, as they are reaſonable creatures, &c.

This is a reaſonleſſe aſſertion: for if baptiſme concern them *as they are reaſonable creatures*, then all ſuch are concerned herein: and ſo the promiſe which *S. Peter* there mentioneth, is to all reaſonable creatures *Jewes*, *Turkes*, *Painims*, for theſe are all *reaſonable creatures*, and may in their converſion *have a title to it*, *in proportion to their nature*: The argument is fallacious *à non cauſâ pro cauſâ* (except the *cauſa ſtolida*, or *cauſa ſine quâ non*) though none but *reaſonable creatures* have intereſt herein, yet all reaſonable creatures have it not; neither alwayes; as in unbelief, impenitency, or out of the covenant, as infants of unbelieving parents: it is not their reaſon, but Gods covenant which gives them intereſt in the promiſe of ſalvation and all things thereto ſubordinate and belonging. Note here, to what unreaſonable concluſions willfull errour will lead men at laſt: what more perverſe, then in the proſecution of their diſlike to infant-baptiſme, to allow more to children of profeſſed enemies of *Chriſt*, as *Turkes* and *Jewes*, then to infants of *Chriſtian* parents with whom God made his covenant of grace and mercy? They affirme that even infants of *Turkes* and *Jewes* are *ſanctified in the moment of their birth*, but will not allow children of believing parents baptiſme, which is but the externall ſeal of the covenant, which the very reprobate may, and doth ſometime receive at their hands, who cannot judge of any perſons finall eſtate: and who knowes not, that ſanctification

Acts 2.38, 39.

See Mr. *Cobbet* explicat. Luke 18.15. Pa. 125.

Mr. *Fiſher* in his diſpute at *Folkſton* in *Kent. March.* 10 1650.

is

is incomparably greater and more excellent then the external ſeal: this man can give, that God onely can give, and giveth it to the elect only; and without that, the externall ſeal ſhall availe nothing. But you go on.

Beſides this, I ſay, the words mentioned in S. Peters Sermon (which are the only record of the promiſe) are interpreted upon a weake miſtake: the promiſe belongs to you, and to your children; therefore infants are actually receptive of it in that capacity.]

Certainly Gods promiſe is of that invincible ſtrength that whoſoever pleads againſt it, none (no not the gates of hell) ſhall ever overthrow it: and as certainly the inference was ſtrong once, upon the ſame ground, when God had made the promiſe to *Abraham and his ſeed*; and therefore, and then his infants in that capacity were receptive, actually receptive, of the ſeal of the ſame righteouſneſſe of faith: and certainly infants do no leſſe belong to the covenant and Church of God, then thoſe that are of yeares of diſcretion, which is evident by Gods promiſe made unto *Abraham*, *I will eſtabliſh my covenant betweene me and thee, and thy ſeed after thee — this is my covenant — every male child among you ſhall be circumciſed — he that is eight dayes old ſhall be circumciſed* — the very ſame promiſe doth *S. Peter* rehearſe and expound *Act.* 2. 39. *for to you is the promiſe, and to your children, and to all that are a farre off, even as many as the Lord our God ſhall call:* for indeed, by one ſpirit *we are all baptiſed into one body, whether we be Jewes or Gentiles*, &c. And let the reader marke, that after the *Apoſtle* had exhorted every one of them to be baptiſed for the remiſſion of ſins, he deriveth not the ground and reaſon thereof from their age, nor from their repentance, nor from their years of diſcretion, but from the promiſe of God, which was no leſſe to their children in that very capacity, then to themſelves: for the ſigne of the covenant, Baptiſme, appertaineth to them alſo, as being partakers of the common ſalvation in *Chriſt*. Laſtly, how our infants have forfeited or loſt the capacity, which 'tis moſt certaine the infants of *Jewes* had, I know not, nor will the pleader ever make it appeare to us. You ſay further,

Jerem. Baſting, de baptiſm. Quæſt. 74. 4.

See the learned and judicious Mr. Richard Baxter, on Matth. 28. 19. plain Scripture proof of infants Church-membership, and baptiſme.

Geneſ. 17. 7. 10, 12.

1 Cor. 12, 13.

But

But he, that whenever the word (children) is uſed in Scripture ſhall by (children) underſtand infants, muſt needs believe, that in all Iſrael there were no men, but all were infants: and if that had been true, it had been the greater wonder they ſhould overcome the Anakims, and beat the King of Moab, and march ſo farre, and diſcourſe ſo well, for they were all called the children of Iſrael.

Videat quis vult. V. Schindler. pentaglot. in בב *Pag. 212. E. 213. c. 214. c. 1. Gen. 17. Act. 2. 39.*

We know the word (*children*) importeth not alwayes infants; what then? becauſe it doth not in every place of Scripture ſignify *infants*, therefore doth it not any where, no not where infants are ſpoken of? the promiſe before ſpecified was to all *Iſrael*, and their infants, and unto them the ſeal of the covenant and promiſe appertained; but becauſe the men of wiſdome and valour were included under the name of *children*, were there no infants among them? or doe you not take a child of eight dayes old (when it was by Gods command and covenant to receive the ſeal) to be an infant? and why not now? ſeeing the promiſe is as well and ſure to us, who (though then farre off) have now by the free mercy of God, been called to the ſaving knowledge of the goſpel: for that promiſe of God to *Abraham*, did not ſo belong to his ſeed according to the fleſh, as that it appertaines not unto us alſo: for the *Apoſtle* clearly teſtifieth, that it *was not given to Abraham or his ſeed through the law, but through the righteouſneſſe of faith* — and he was *the father of all them that believe, though they be not circumciſed, that righteouſneſſe might be imputed to them alſo* — and again he ſaith--- *they which are of faith, the ſame are the children of Abraham*: ſo Chriſt ſaid that *Zache* converted to the ſame faith, was that day the ſon of *Abraham*: and indeed the eternall covenant which God made with *Abraham's* ſeed, that he would be their God, is not chiefly verified in his carnall ſeed, for very few of them for ſome hundred years laſt paſt have been Gods people, but rather profeſſed enemies to thoſe that are: and therefore that covenant muſt be underſtood of *Abraham's* children according to that promiſe, which is as ſure and well to us who believe, as ever it was to the *Iſraelites*: and ſo we and our children are as juſtly to be reckoned children of *Abraham*, and

Rom. 4. 11. 13. Gal. 3. 7.

Luk. 19. 9.

heirs

heirs of that promiſe, as they ever were: and if within the covenant, and heires of the ſame promiſe, what incapacity barreth our children from the ſame priviledges thereto ſubordinate, and from the ſeal of admittance unto the ſame, more then barred the carnall or naturall children of *Abraham* from the ſeal of the covenant, which then was in uſe?

And for the allegation of S. Paul, that infants are holy if their parents be faithfull, it ſignifies nothing but that they are holy by deſignation, juſt as Jeremy, and John Baptiſt were ſanctified in their mothers womb, that is, they were appointed and deſigned for holy miniſteries, &c.] Pag. 2[illegible]. Numb. 20

We anſwer, whether you mean literally by *holy miniſtries*, the office of prieſt or prophet; or myſtically, *a royall prieſthood*, to offer up *ſpirituall ſacrifice acceptable to God by Jeſus Chriſt*, that which you affirme will appeare very falſe; for many of the children of believers, are neither prieſts, prophets, nor ſo ſanctified as to offer up *ſpirituall* ſacrifice *acceptable to God:* now the *Apoſtle* ſaith not, *elſe were ſome of your children unholy; but, now are they holy*, without exception of any: ſo that his words being infallibly true, there muſt be ſome ſuch holineſſe there intended, as univerſally concernes all that are born of believing parents; which cannot be true in your ſenſe of diſignation to holy miniſtries, nor in the other ſenſe concerning ſanctification by the ſpirit of adoption and regeneration peculiar to the elect of God: nor is it to be underſtood, as ſome think, of a meer political cleanneſſe (ſeeing that, out of the Church alſo, there is a difference between the legitimate and ſpurious children) it muſt be underſtood therefore of a federall, or *eccleſiaſticall* holineſſe, to which reprobates (if born of believing parents, or at leaſt of either parent being a believer, and within the covenant) may have right as well as the elect: ſo had *Iſmael*, *Eſau*, and millions more, as well as *Iſaack* and *Iacob*, by this federall or eccleſiaſticall holineſſe they have right unto the ſeal of initiation, and admittance into the *Church*; whereas they who are born of both parents without the Church, are counted unclean, that is, Gods promiſe and the ſeal thereof appertaine not unto them: neither may they be baptiſed, untill Rev. 1. 6. 1 Pet. 2. 5. 1 Cor. 7. 14

growing

growing up and being inſtructed, they repent and embrace the faith of *Chriſt*, and it is not improbable which ſome ſay, that the form of the *Apoſtles* ſpeaking ſeemeth derived from the *Leviticall* law; in which it was ordained, that ſome perſons ſhould for a time be barred (as unclean) from comming within the tents of *Iſrael*: ſo the children of infidels are unclean, and not preſently to be admitted into the Church by baptiſm which is the doore and inlet thereto, ever ſtanding open to the clean: and as under the law, ſome beaſts were clean and ſome unclean, that is by a *Leviticall* or ceremonial cleaneſſe, or uncleaneſſe, for it was neither ſpirituall, nor civill: ſo the *Apoſtle* 1 Cor. 7. 14. underſtandeth an eccleſiaſticall holineſſe, that is, a *Church*-priviledge, to be admitted to baptiſme: ſo that indeed the *Pleader weakly miſtaketh* when he concludeth, that *juſt ſo the children of Chriſtian parents are ſanctified, that is, deſigned to the ſervice of Jeſus Chriſt, and the future participation of the promiſes:* but he ſaith further,

Jo. Gerhard. de S. Bap. S 4. de pedobapt.

D. Mercer. To. 3. diſp. 14. theſ. 116. citat. a. J. Gerh. quo jup.

Pag. 234. Num. 21.

And as the promiſe appertaines not (for ought appeares) to infants in that capacity and conſiſtence, but only by the title of their being reaſonable creatures, and when they come to that act of which by nature they have the faculty, &c.]

Matth. 13. 14, 15.

No colour or proportion can appeare to the blind, or thoſe who willfully ſhut their eyes, nor any truth, be it never ſo evident to them on whom is the curſe *Iſai.* 6. 9. 10. As for that you ſay concerning the title of *their being reaſonable creatures*, I referre the reader to that which hath been anſwered, *Numb.* 19. Onely adding here: if the promiſe of God appertaine to infants onely as they are reaſonable creatures, what was the priviledge of the *Jew*, or what profit was there of circumciſion? the *Apoſtle* ſaith, *much every way*: and what is the advantage of the believing Chriſtians child, and Gods covenant with them? what, no more then of *Turkes*, and *Jewes?* where is then that promiſe, *I will be a God unto thee, and thy ſeed*, interpreted by *S. Peter, the promiſe is to you and your children, and to as many as the Lord our God ſhall call?* what, is it of force only to men and women of yeares; where's the infants part? where is his priviledge of federall holineſſe,

Pag. 226.

Rom. 3. 1. 2.

Geneſ. 17. 7. Act. 2. 39.

holyneſſe, as being borne of believing parents? What muſt they be intereſſed onely when they come to that act of which by nature they have the faculty? That is the act of underſtanding, faith and repentance? In thoſe acts, the perſons and children of *Turks* and *Jews* have a right in the ſame promiſes; you cannot exclude any perſon from baptiſm, who believes in Chriſt, repenteth, and deſireth baptiſm at your hands: Thus you make the promiſe of God concerning the children of the faithfull of no effect, by your tradition and vain opinion. But to amend this, you ſay,

Baptiſm is not the means of conveying the holy Ghoſt.]

I ſuppoſe you mean the ordinary gifts and graces of the holy Ghoſt, as faith, love, hope, ſanctity, *&c.* if not, there may be a double fallacy in your aſſertion: Firſt in the term (*conveying*) and next in the term (*holy Ghoſt*) both which may be *homonymically* intended; and then your diſcourſe is meerly captious; and to diſcover it, is a ſufficient anſwer: and indeed by your following words, (*God by that miracle did give teſtimony, &c.*) it ſeems you mean, that baptiſm is not now the ordinary means of *conveying the holy Ghoſt*, that is, the gift of miracles unto the baptized: if ſo, here is both an *homonymia*, and an *ignoratio elenchi*: Your reaſon being reduced to a Syllogiſme, you might take theſe words (*the holy Ghoſt*) for the ordinary gifts and graces of God, neceſſary to ſalvation, in the one propoſition, and for the extraordinary in the other, and ſo the queſtion were miſtaken; which is not whether baptiſm be an ordinary means of conveying the extraordinary gifts of the holy Ghoſt into the baptized, as ſpeaking divers unſtudied languages, curing the ſick, raiſing the dead, caſting out devils, *&c.* which we affirm not; but whether baptiſm (as the word preached) be not the external ordinary means by God appointed, to ſeal us up to a lively hope in Chriſt, to beget faith, and to engage us to repentance and newneſs of life? to which, all that you here trifle concerning impoſition of hands, and inſinuation of rite to confirmation, is nothing to purpoſe; neither is the caſe of *Cornelius* and *Peters* argument there-

on, any waies advantagious to you: for, you confeſs it a miracle; and how then is it pertinent to our preſent queſtion? You ſay, that God by that miracle, *did give teſtimony, that the perſons of the men were in great diſpoſition to heaven, and therefore were to be admitted to thoſe rites, which are the ordinary inlets into the kingdom of heaven*: I then demand, if that argument be good, Are not children of believing parents to be admitted to thoſe rites which are the ordinary *inlets into the kingdom of heaven*, ſeeing they are alſo *in great diſpoſition to heaven* whom Chriſt bleſſed, and propoſed for paterns to all that ſhall enter therein? But we anſwer, 1. That the great diſpoſition which you talk of, was not ſo much the gift of miracles, as the perſons inward baptiſm by the ſpirit of regeneration and ſanctification: for the gift of miracles is not of it ſelf, any certain argument of ſalvation: ſee *Matth.* 7. 22, 23. but this was a ſufficient warrant to *Peter* to baptize them, as being marked out thereby for the viſible Church at leaſt, into which elect and reprobate may come. 2. To the main we anſwer. That as by delivering a key, putting in poſſeſſion of an houſe is not only ſignified, but alſo livery and ſeiſin, the conveyance and *chirogrophum* are paſſed, confirmed and actually made ſure: So in baptiſm by water, the waſhing which is wrought by the blood of Chriſt, is not only figured, but alſo at laſt fulfilled in the elect by Chriſt. 3. In a right uſe of the Sacraments, the things therby ſignified are ever held out and convey'd together with the ſignes, which are neither fallacious, empty, nor void of a due effect, or without the thing repreſented (becauſe they are of God, who cannot deceive, and is able to give the effect) if the receiver do not *ponere obicem*: therefore the Sacraments are rightly called the *Channels* or *Conduits of grace*, that is, the ordinary means to convey the graces of God into the receivers. 4. God confirms his mercies to us by the Sacraments, wherein the Miniſter, by Gods own deputation, beareth his perſon or place in the Church, as well as in preaching the word, ſo that what they doe (who are his Miniſters) by his appointment, he doth, both in reſpect of the inſtitution and effect. So the Lord is ſaid to have anoin-

Baſling. quo ſup. de bapt. infan. 2.

Urſin. de relig. Chriſtian. par. 2. concluſ. 9.

Math. 20. Luk. 9. 15.

ted

ted *Saul*, whereas *Samuel* anointed him: ſo Jeſus made and baptizedmore diſciple then *John*, whereas *Jeſus baptized not, but his diſciples*, by his aſſignement: Therefore although theſe ſignes neither convey grace, nor confirm any thing to them for good who keep not the Covenant (for God made no promiſe to them) yet are they means to convey the graces of God to thoſe that do. To conclude, we affirm not that baptiſm conveyeth Gods grace to all that are baptized, but to the elect only, as that whereof he hath made a peculiar promiſe to them; and that ſo certain as are thoſe things which God himſelf ſealeth, covenanteth for, and teſtifieth in heaven and earth; as 'tis written, *There are three that bear record in heaven, the father, the word, and the holy Ghoſt — and there are three that bear witneſs in earth, the ſpirit, and the water, and the blood. — Now if we receive the witneſs of men, the witneſs of God is greater.* Under the mouth of two or three witneſſes, every word muſt be confirmed, and taken for ſure; how much more when we have by Gods bleſſing, the ſame witneſſes of our faith, who are alſo the promiſers (workers, and ſureties of our ſalvation?

1 Sam. 10. 1

Joh. 4.1,2.

1 Joh. 5.7. &c.

Si in tribus teſtibus ſtabit omne verbum, quanto magis dum habemus per benedictionem eoſdem arbitros fidei, quos & ſponſores ſalutis. Tertul. de bapt. c. 6.

But from thence (you ſay) *to argue, that wherever there is a capacity of receivinig the ſame grace, there alſo the ſame ſigne is to be miniſtred, and from thence to infer pœdo-baptiſm, is an argument very fallacious, &c.*]

Quis tulerit Gracchos — ? your diſpute is fallacious upon your grounds, on which we go not; and ſo all your impertinent ſuperſtruction here falleth together.

They that are capable of the ſame grace, are not alwaies capable of the ſame ſigne: for women under the law of Moſes, *although they were capable of the righteouſneſs of faith, yet they were not capable of the ſigne of circumciſion.*]

I would gladly be reſolved, *quanta eſt illa propoſitio?* is your meaning, *Some of them that are capable of the ſame grace, are not alwaies capable* of the ſigne thereof? If ſo, *alta pax eſto*: We ſay ſo too: for infants, being capable of the ſame grace which is exhibited and received in the Lords ſupper, are not alwaies (that is, while they are children) capable of the ſame ſigne, becauſe they cannot exa-

min themſelves, nor ſhew forth the Lords death: and women not only under the Law, but now alſo have and ever will have for ought you can ſay, the ſame incapacity of circumciſion; what makes this to conclude childrens incapacity of baptiſm? this is to argue *à genere ad genus*; though women had not a capacity of that ſigne, they have a capacity of baptiſm; infants had then a right to that whereof they had a capacity: let them have ſo ſtill, and the controverſie is ended. You further ſay,

The gift of the holy Ghoſt — was ordinarily given by impoſition of hands, and that after baptiſm.]

pag. 235. Concerning impoſition of hands, ſee the learned Animadverſions of *N. Homes* upon Mr. *Tombes* his exercit. about infant-bapt. pag. 59. &c. Pag. 235. Num. 22.

By this it appears, that your foregoing argument was fallacious, you intending the extraordinary gifts of the holy Ghoſt, which we pretend not to; and what is this diſpute to us now, or to the preſent queſtion, ſeeing they are long ſince ceaſed? But beware your lying too near a wind, and mentioning *criſme*, or *confirmation* and ſanctifying the holy Apoſtles, diſpleaſe not your clyents, and you be taken for an *ambidexter*. But you ſay,

After all this, leſt theſe arguments ſhould not aſcertain their cauſe, they fall on complaing againſt God, &c.]

Vatin. de Circumciſ. pag. par. 2.

Tell true, and ſhame the devil: where? to whom? when? which of all the reformed Churches ever did ſo? We clearly affirm that God is ever, and alike to be believed, whether by ſignes, or by words which ſignifie his will: we ſay not that *God did more for the children of the Jews*; but that your peeviſhneſs, denying children baptiſm, would have it ſeem ſo. Do we then complain againſt God, when we complain of the *Anabaptiſts* abridging children of that which God hath allowed them? How vain and malitious is this calumny of yours? But you ſay,

He made a covenant of ſpiritual promiſes on his part, and ſpiritual and reall ſervices on ours.]

What are theſe real ſervices, and whoſe? if of children, what can they, as ſuch, perform? but you ſay, *this pertains to children when they are capable, but made with them aſſoon as they are alive* (that is in the mothers womb) what this? this covenant? ſo the words ſeem to import: nay,

but

but undeniably Gods covenant and ſpiritual promiſes on his part, preſently belong to them who ſhall be ſaved, for many of them preſently die: or mean you by (*this*) ſpiritual and real ſervices on our part, belong to children when they are capable? Surely then they cannot have this covenant made with them *as ſoon as they are born*, otherwiſe then by baptiſm; becauſe for the preſent they can perform nothing *real*: If you mean ſpiritual and real ſervices of parents in relation to their covenanted infants, as ſuch, they cannot yet teach them: they can only preſent them to the Church, that the publick ſeal of Gods covenant being ſet to them, they may according to their true intereſt in her external communion, be thereby marked, and known for parts and members of the ſame: and this indeed pertaineth to children when they are capable, that is, as ſoon as they are born. That which you infer to ſhew a diſparity between *Chriſtian* infants, and the *Jews babes*, is frivolous: for thoug there appear ſome ſhew of difference in circumſtance, as the particular promiſe of the inheritance of *Canaan*, &c. yet for ſubſtance there is none; there being as real a promiſe of bleſſings to *Chriſtians* and their children in every kind: for godlineſs hath the promiſe *of this life, and that which is to come*, and the preſent ſeal of faith marketh them for Gods *peculiar people*; the effect whereof being wrought and perfected by the ſpirit of *Jeſus* in their regeneration, the work is done in them (and no otherwiſe was it in the *Jews children*) for he is not a *Jew* which is one outwardly, *neither is that circumciſion, which is outward in the fleſh; — but circumciſion is that of the heart, in the ſpirit*, Rom. 2. 28, 29. Col 2. 11, 12. and the *Jewiſh children* were no otherwiſe ſealed then into the ſame faith of *Jeſus*, nor otherwiſe ſaved, then by faith in him, neither leſs ſaved then we and our childcen.

1 Tim. 4. 8. Tit. 3. 6, 7. &c. Tit. 3. 14.

This (ſay you) *is the greateſt vanity in the world*] pag. 136.

What vanity? you ſay, to affirm that *unleſs this mercy be conſigned by baptiſm, as good not at all in reſpect of us, becauſe we want the comfort of it*. This is the vanity — well let it be ſo; and let them own it that will: I known not whom you mean; I am ſure there appears vanity enough in your following

following aſſertion, and reaſon offered for proof.

Shall not (ſay you) *this promiſe, this Word of God be of ſufficient truth, certainty, and efficacy, to cauſe comfort, unleſs we tempt God, and require a ſigne of him?*]

Yes, Gods promiſe is of ſufficient truth, and certaine efficacy thereto: therefore we baptize our children: and it had been ſufficient on Gods part, and it muſt have been on ours, had he not ſeen good further to confirm us by a ſeal ſet to his promiſe; or had he not required more of us, as our duty and a condition and ſeal of his covenant with us & our children: for as *Auguſtine* ſaith, how much available, even without the viſible Sacrament of baptiſme, is that which the *Apoſtle* ſaith *Rom.* 10.10. *With the heart man believeth unto righteouſneſſe, and with the mouth Confeſſion is made unto ſalvation*, was declared in the penitent thiefe: but then it is inviſibly fulfilled, when not any contempt of religion, but a point or moment of neceſſity, excludeth or preventeth baptiſme: for it might have ſeem'd much more ſuperfluous in *Cornelius* and his friends to be baptized, who had already received the gift of the holy *Ghoſt*, then in the thiefe: yet they were baptized: and in that act, the *Apoſtolicall* authority is extant, as alſo the neceſſity of obeying God in his ordinance: now how childiſh and perverſe is that cavill — *unleſſe we tempt God, and require a ſigne of him?* Do you account obedience to God and his holy ordinances, to be a tempting of God? is bringing children to *Chriſt* (which he commandeth) and that by baptiſme (which you confeſſe is the ordinary inlet into the kingdome of heaven) to require a ſigne of him, or is it to receive a ſigne of him by his own appointment? and what *certainity of comfort* could we concieve, if on the contrary, we ſhould wilfully diſobey, neglect, and contemn Gods ordinance, as your clients do? were it not rather to tempt God, if (as much as in us lies) we ſhould ſhut up the doore and inlet into his kingdome againſt infants? man can do no more to ſhut them out, then by denying them baptiſme: 'tis true, that God can, and often doth ſave them without our miniſtry, as when death preventeth our baptiſing them: but to neglect the ordinary means of our own or others

Luk. 23.42.43

Quantum valet etiam ſine viſibili ſacramento baptiſmi, quod ait Apoſtolus, corde creditur ad juſtitiam, ore autem confeſſio fit ad ſalutem: in illo latrone declaratum eſt: ſed tunc impletur inviſibiliter, cum myſterium baptiſmi non contemptus religionis, ſed articulus neceſſitatis excludit: nam multò magis in Cornelio & in amicis ejus, quam in latrone, poſſit videri ſuperfluum, ut aquâ etiam tingerentur in quibus jam donum ſpiritus Sancti, &c Aug. *de bapt. contr. Donat. l.4. c. 22.*

others ſalvation, and to put it on the extraordinary power of God, is to tempt God: if I ſhould ask you, why you eat, or feed your infants, ſeeing God can preſerve you and them without food? you would eaſily ſay, to neglect the ordinary means, were to tempt God, ſo 'tis here. But you ſay.

A wicked & adulterous generation ſeeketh after a ſigne, &c.]

Poſſibly, Mr. *Fiſher* at his *Aſhford*-conference was beholding to you for this opprobrie, and abuſe of holy Scripture: but we entreat you ſeriouſly and timely to conſider the ſeverity of the Judge who hath ſaid concerning any that take his name in vain, *I will not hold him guiltleſſe*, and whether pernicious playing with holy Scripture, and willfull perverting the ſenſe thereof, fall not under the ſentence of ſelf-deſtruction: conſider the terrors which Chriſt uſeth *Matth* 12. 38, 39. and *Matth.* 16. 4. the thing which the *Scribes* & *Phariſes* required, was σημεῖον, which word, though it ſignify divers things, as may appeare by comparing *Mat.* 14. 3. & 26. 48. *Luk.* 2. 12. *Rom.* 4. 11. 2. *Theſſ.* 3. 17. yet is it more then manifeſt, that they required a miracle, and that extraordinary, and above all thoſe divine works of Chriſt, which hitherto they had ever ſeen, as caſting out devils, raiſing the dead, &c. they required a ſigne *from* or out of *heaven*, *Matth.* 16. 1. *Mark.* 8. 11. and then Chriſt anſwered, *a wicked and adulterous generation ſeeketh after a ſigne*; that is τέρας a wonder; which words are often joyned to expreſſe the ſame thing; μαοτέρας commonly ſignifies a *prodigie*, or *monſter*. *Suidas* gives it by παράδοξμα, παρὰ φύσιν τερᾶτον, ἢ σημεῖον, *præter ordinariam rationem formatum, præter naturam genitum*: ſuch a ſigne as begetteth admiration and amazement in the beholders; and ſo the *Syriack Joh.* 4. 48, expreſſeth it by a word comming of that verbe which ſignifieth, *to be amazed*, or very much to admire: now I appeale to your conſcience; do we ſeek any ſuch ſigne or miracle from heaven, when we bring children to be baptized? is not this froathy-*Rethorick*? you confeſſe baptiſme to be the *ordinary*

See *Mr.* Wilcocks *infant. baptiſme maintained.* Pag. 2.

Exod. 20.

2 Pet. 3. 16.

σημεῖον ἐκ τῶν οὐρανῶν.

Joh. 4. 48.
Acts 2. 43.
Acts 4. 3.
Acts 5. 12.
Acts 6. 8.
Acts 7. 37. &c.

Παρὰ φύσιν γινόμενον
Quod præter naturam ſit natum, ib. Suid. portentum, &c. Stephan. ſæpe de inuſitatis & inſolitis, ſeu monſtris & prodigiis, &c. Tr ſt. lex. Syr. p. 186.

Tremel. & M. Troſt. Syr. Teſt. ל֫וֹמְסַיְנָא à verbo דמר ל֫וֹמְסַיְנָא. Ethpah. *ſtupuit, obſtupuit* Joh. Buxtorf. *Jun. lex. Chald. & Syr. Val. Shindl. Pent.* דמר Jo. 8. 39. 44.

in-

inlet into the kingdome of heaven; and is an ordinary thing a *ſigne* or *miracle*? conſider alſo the perſons of whom *Chriſt* ſpake; they were a wicked and an *adulterous generation*: for though they pretended to be *Abrahams* children, yet neither heiring him in faith or works, but degenerating from him, they deſervedly heard —— *ye are of your father the devil*: if this preſent generation be ſuch, conſider who makes it ſo; and whether you have any commiſſion to judge them wicked who profeſſe true faith and obedience to *Jeſus Chriſt*, and his holy goſpel, in all things, that any ſhall, or can make appeare to us to be the truth? But you ſay

The truth 'ont is, this argument is nothing but a direct quarrelling with almighty God.]

The untruth of this aſſertion is ſo evident, that it were but loſt labour to beſtow more words to refute it.

Pag. 85. Numb. 3. *Now ſince there is no ſtrength in the doctrinall part, &c.*]

I appeale to the judicious reader; let him judge what ſtrength hath appeared in your oppoſitions, concerning the words which you here multiply to little if any purpoſe. I ſhall ſay no more, but onely marke the ſtrength of the pleaders preſent argument, the ſum whereof is; Some *Apoſtolicall traditions were pro loco & tempore*, accommodate to place and time (as the forementioned, love ——feaſts, ſaluting with an holy kiſſe, anointing the ſick abſteining from blood, &c.) *therefore* no *Apoſtolicall traditions paſſed an engagement upon following ages*. We anſwer: we contend not for any ſuch traditions as were *pro loco & tempore*, yet doth it not follow that becauſe all *Apoſtolicall* traditions engage not poſterities, therefore none do, as in that inſtance concerning the ſabbath, I ſuppoſe you will accord with us. But you ſay

Becauſe other parallel expreſſions of Scripture do determin and expound themſelves to a ſinſe that includes not all perſons abſolutely, but of a capable condition, as, Adorate eum omnes gentes, & pſallite Deo, &c.]

Suppoſe all that granted, what then? you would inferre that infants have not a condition capable of baptiſme, becauſe ſome other places of Scripture are relating to capahci ty; what makes this againſt the baptiſme of infants, who beig-

beeing within Gods covenant are therefore capable of the ſeal thereof, as they were under the law, although even then the Scripture ſaying *pſallite Deo omnes, &c.* ſaid that to thoſe only who could ſing to God and praiſe him, and not unto infants of eight-dayes old to be circumciſed? who know's not, that God commanded ſeverall things with reſpect to ſeverall capacities? doth the incapacity in reſpect of one command, conclude an incapacity of all? women were not capable of circumciſion, nor of the office of teaching in the congregation, nor of execution of prieſtly offices; yet they alſo could and ought to ſing to the Lord, and were of that part of nations commanded to praiſe the Lord. *Pſal.* 148. 12. *Pſal.* 149. 3, 5. *Exod.* 15. 20, 21. *Judg.* 5. 1. Infants had not a capacity of ſinging praiſes to God, they had of circumciſion, and therefore they were then circumciſed, though they could not ſing: infants cannot ſing now, therefore that precept, *ſing unto the Lord,* &c. concerneth them not for preſent; but they can be baptized as ſuch, therefore that precept *baptiſe all nations*, reacheth unto them; you ſay more,

As for the conjecture concerning the family of Stephanas, at the beſt it is but a conjecture, and beſides that it is not proved that there were children in the family: yet if that were granted, it followes not that they were baptized, becauſe by (whole families) in ſcripture is *meant all perſons of reaſon and age within the family*] Pag. 236. 237. Numb. 24. 1 Cor. 1. 16.

Admit that to be conjectural, and we take it for no more; yet it is no light conjecture, (the Syriac gives it *& filij domus ejus omnes*, ſpeaking of the keeper of the priſon, *Act.* 16. 33.) that children were baptized with the reſt of the family: for though בן there alſo may ſignify any domeſtick, yet certainly it ſignifieth a child alſo, and children were uſually domeſticks: but it can be no more then a light conjecture of *Anabaptiſts*, that there were no infants in this family, or that of *Stephanas* which *Paul* baptized; howſoever it can be no conjecture, but certaine truth, that in *all nations* there ever were and ſtill are, a great part infants; and it is more then conjecturall, that the *Apoſtles* did as *Chriſt* commanded

וּבְנֵי בֵיתֵהּ כֻּלְהוֹן *Tremel.*

them, ſaying *baptize all nations*; as for that which you ſay, *in Scripture is meant all perſons of reaſons and age within the family*, becauſe it is ſaid that the *ruler at Capernaum believed, and all his houſe:* is that propoſition univerſall? doe you affirme that by *whole families*, is ever meant *all perſons of age within the family*, and ſuch only? if ſo, your aſſertion is apparently falſe; but if your propoſition be particular, it falleth ſhort of our cauſe; for what can it hurt it, if by *all*, or *whole families* in Scripture, ſometimes is meant all perſons of reaſon and *age*? deale ingenuouſly then; do you affime that by *whole*, or all, the Scripture doth alwayes meane, *perſons of reaſon and age*? what doth God, when he ſaid to *Abraham — and in thee all the families of the earth ſhall be bleſſed*; doth he meane only all *perſons of age*? are children in their *nonage* excluded from the bleſſing in *Chriſt*? Nay but the *Apoſtle* ſaith expreſly, *the promiſe is unto you, and to your children*: and ſuch *Chriſt bleſſed*, and of ſuch is the kingdome of heaven. Doth the Scripture, *Geneſ.* 7.21? ſaying *all fleſh dyed — every man* — meane onely *all of reaſon and age*? were the infants excepted? many places of Scripture may ſhew the vanity of this your aſſertion: but if your propoſition be particular, that is, that ſometimes the Scripture by *whole families* means perſons of *reaſon* (that is who have the uſe of reaſon) *and age*: we can grant it you; I adde; ſomtimes, *all*, ſignifieth only a great part; as *Mat.* 10.22 *ye ſhall be hated of all men for my names ſake*: that is of many: times in the *Hebrew* manner of ſpeaking it ſignifies, *none*, or *not any one:* as Pſal. 147. 20. *he hath not done ſo-* לְכָל־גּוֹי, *to all*, or *every nation*: that is, not to any; ſo *Exod.* 12. 43. כָּל־בֶּן, &c. *every ſon of a ſtranger ſhall not eate thereof*, that is *none*: now would you have the ſenſe of *Chriſts* words *goe and baptize all nations*, to be, go and *baptize ſome nations*, or *a major part of the nations*? the evidence of the truth is againſt that, as well as againſt the other, go and *baptiſe none*; but you would faine have it, go and baptize thoſe that are perſons of *reaſon and age* within the nations: ſhew us any ſuch precept of *Chriſt*, and we will obey it; in the meane time we muſt do that which we know he commanded us, that

Gen 12 5.
Acts. 3 25.
כל מִשְׁפְּחוֹת, *omnes familiæ terræ.* 70. πᾶσαι αἱ πατριαὶ τῆς γῆς.
Acts 2.39.
See Lev.25.10
Numb 2. 34.
and 3. 15.39.
and 18. 31.
and 33. 54.
Levit.25.13.
Num.20. 22.
Acts 7. 10.
Rom. 4. 16.
and 10. 12.
and 11. 32.
Matth. 12.15.
1 Cor.10. 1.2.
&c. 1 The.3.12
2 Theſ. 3. 16.
18. 1 Tim.4.
10. Joh.11.
50, &c.
Eſt autem & hoc Scripturæ idioma ut omnes dicat pro pluribus. Euth. in Matth. 10.

that is, baptize all nations, all againſt whom we finde no exception: and why ſhould we look for exception in families, ſeeing we find none mentioned by our *Saviour* in nations? but you would have here, a limitation to capacity, which you think infants have not: firſt we ſay, ſhew us any Scripture-proofe for ſuch limitation: ſecondly we ſay that although the incapacity of an infant limit a command where there appeareth a preſent impoſſibility of doing that which God in generall commandeth (as where he ſaith believe, repent, confeſſe your ſins, ſing unto God, praiſe him, &c) for God commandeth no impoſſibilities: yet where it is poſſible that the command may be fulfilled, there lieth no ſuch limitation: now you will not ſay that 'tis impoſſible for infants to be baptized: if you ſay they ought not to be baptized untill they can actually believe, repent, &c. we muſt anſwer you with your own; *this is unmanlike to build upon ſuch ſlight and aery conjectures*, as are humane fancies, to forbid infants baptiſme; and when you can bring us no ſolid ground for that you would have, to beg the queſtion. But you ſay, P.237.Nu.25.

Tradition by all meanes muſt ſupply the place of Scripture: and there is pretended a tradition Apoſtolicall, that infants were baptized, &c.]

You ſeem here to ſpeake three things: firſt, that when we cite traditions, we uſe them in place of Scripture, or for defect of Scripture-proofe: which to deny, is confutation enough untill you can ſhew which of us ſo pretend to tradition. Secondly in your following words you pretend, that we ſometimes reject *Apoſtolicall* tradition (for of that you ſpeake) to which we ſay, that when the quæſtion is concerning a tradition of the goſpel or *Apoſtles*, as *Epiphanius* ſpeakes, we receive it; and with an ancient Council wiſh that thoſe things may be done in the *Church*, *which were delivered by divine Scripture or Apoſtolical tradition*; which we adde hereto, though we have no reaſon to admit of all that is al-

Παραδόσις τοῦ τε ἐυαγγελίου, καὶ τῶν Ἀποστόλων. *Ephiphan. To. 2. expoſit. fidei* τὰ παραδιδόμενα ὑπὸ τῶν θειῶν γραφῶν, καὶ τῶν ἀποστολικῶν παραδόσεων, ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ γίνεσθαι εὐχόμεθα. *Concil. Gangrens. Canon. 21. Severin. Bin. Concil. To. 1. Jud. 12. v. de quibus Concil. Laodicen. Can. 28. 16. Bin. Quod traditum tenet univerſitas Eccleſiæ, cum parvuli infantes baptizantur. Aug. To. 7. part 1. de bapt. contra Donat. l. 4. c. 23, &c.*

ledged for ſuch: as for thoſe things which the *Apoſtles* delivered in complyance with particular times, places, or perſons, as anointing with oyl, ſaluting with an holy kiſſe, love-feaſts, &c. they were neceſſary then and to that people who had been long accuſtomed thereto, of whom a goſpel-Church was now to be gathered; but they were neither univerſally preſcribed, neither do they concern us now. Next we ſay with *S. Auguſtine*; *the whole Church holdeth by tradition the baptiſm of infants*; and that beeing continually obſerved, we juſtly believe to have been delivered and confirmed by *Apoſtolicall tradition.* But you ſay,

So farre as it can appeare, it relies wholly upon the teſtimony of Origen; for from him Auguſtine had it, &c.]

Yet before you affirmed, that infant-baptiſme was *Auguſtin's device*; how had *Auguſtine it from Origen* if it were *Auguſtin's device?* That it was neither his device, neither that it *relyeth wholly upon the teſtimony of Origen*, many other teſtimonis by us alleaged, make manifeſt; as *Dionyſius*, *Irenæus*, *Cyprian*, *Ambroſ Jerom*, *Cyril*, *Gre. Nazianzen*, *Baſil*, &c. as alſo ancient, *Councils*, as that of *Carthage An*ᵒ. 407. *the Milevitan. An*ᵒ. 420, *&c.* to conclude, we rely not upon the teſtimony of man, though we reverence holy antiquity, but on the command of *Chriſt* and the *Apoſtles* practiſes, baptiſing whole nations without any appearing exception to infants of believing parents; and therefore you following inferences either nothing concern, or nothing hurt us. You ſay further,

There was no command of Scripture to oblige children to the ſuſception of it.]

No command to children to oblige them! a dainty caption: neither was there any command to infants to oblige them to the ſuſception of circumciſion; for they could neither act nor underſtand that or any other command: The command was to the parents for preſent, and to children for the future: therefore, if you meane that there was no command of Scripture to oblige us to the baptizing of infants, the contrary appeares *Matth.* 28. 19. But you require expreſſe termes: we rejoyne; what expreſſe termes in Scripture have

Dionyſ. Hierar. c. ult. Irenæ. l. 2. c. 39. Cyprian l. 2. ep. 8. ad Fidum. Amb. de Abraham. l. 2 c. 11. nec ſenex (inquit) nec infans vernaculus excipitur, quia omnis ætas peccato obnoxia, & ideò omnis ætas ſacramento idonea; nullum excipit, non infantem, &c. *Hieronym. contra Pelag. l. 3.*

have you to prove that there is an holy Trinity in the unity of the deity? or for the abrogating the *Jewiſh Sabbath*, and obſervation of our Lord-day *Sabbath*, or for womens receiving the Lords ſupper, or for your rebaptizing, or dipping over head and ears? But you ſay,

The neceſſity of pedobaptiſm was not determined in the Church till in the eighth age after Chriſt; but in the year 418. *in the* Milevitan *Councel — never till then*]

What neceſſity ſpeak you of? *de neceſſitate medii*, in reſpect of infants ſalvation, as if they could not be ſaved without it? we maintain it not; if you mean ſuch a neceſſity on our part, as bindeth us to obedience, that is, to baptize infants of believing parents; we ſay with S. *Auguſtin*, the cuſtom of our mother the Church in baptizing infants is not at all to be deſpiſed, or by any means to be eſteemed ſuperfluous, nor to be believed any other then an *Apoſtolical tradition*; the ground hereof is laid down, *l.* 3. *c.* 24. *Contra Donat.* before by us cited, to which I refer the reader; the ſum is, That whatſoever is univerſally obſerved in all Churches, and no man can ſay by what Councel it was determined, or when it began, muſt be thought to have deſcended from the tradition of the Apoſtles themſelves, and therefore we hold it as we are commanded, 2 *Theſ.* 2. 15. and we believe it is neceſſary to be held, becauſe 'tis ſo commanded. That which you ſay, that *it was not determined in the Church till in the eighth age after Chriſt, and but in the year* 418 *in the* Milevitan *Councel*, will eaſily appear falſe: for the *Councel of Carthage* in *Cyprians* time, who flouriſhed about the year 250. determined that children might be baptized, and that even before the eight day, againſt the opinion of *Fidus*, as was before noted out of *Cyprian*; but you ſay that infant-baptiſm was not determined in the Church untill the *Milevitan Councel*.

Conſuetudo tamen matris eccleſiæ in baptizandis parvulis, nequaquam pernenda eſt, neque ulla modo ſuperflua deputanda, nec omnino credenda niſi Apoſtolica eſet traditio. Auguſt. de Genes. ad lit. l. 10. c. 23. vid. ad Numb. 13. p. 229.

Cyprian. l. 3. ep. 3. Auguſt ep. 28.

1. I demand, Doth a determination by a ſucceeding Councel exclude a determination of the ſame thing by a foregoing? or doth it conclude a thing to be no Apoſtolical tradition? What think you then of our *Chriſtian Sabbath*? will you ſay that the abrogation of the *Jewiſh Sabbath*, that our

our Chriſtian Sabbath might ſucceed, was not an *Apoſtolical tradition*, or that it was not ſufficiently determined in the Church untill about the year 364. becauſe then there was a Canon made for the ſame in the Councel of *Laodicea*? Nay but the practice of the Apoſtles was a ſufficient determination thereof: And truly, *Eccleſiaſtical Canons* (as alſo municipal Laws and Statutes) may with good reaſon be made for confirmation of things rightly and long before ſufficiently determined, where ſome emergent oppoſition to the former, requireth a due reviſal, and further expreſſion, interpretation, or confirmation of the ſame.

Onuphrius. ὁ δεῖ Χειστανὸς Ιουδαΐζειν καὶ ἐν τῷ σαββάτῳ σχολάζειν. Concil. Laodic. Canon. 29.

2. I ſay, that there needed no determination by a general Councel, before any oppoſition was made publickly againſt a received cuſtome of the Church; but ſo ſoon as it was queſtioned and openly oppoſed by the *Pelagians*, then the ſecond *Milevitan* Councel was called againſt *Pelagius* and *Celeſtius*. It were but a weak argument againſt an *Apoſtolical* tradition, if we ſhould find little or no mention thereof in any writer, in ſome ages of the *Primitive Church*; ſeeing that beſides that there were ſome of them obſcure, generally without *Eccleſiaſtical Writers*; what neceſſity can be alleadged, that in every age ſome writers muſt make particular mention and reherſal of all *Apoſtolical traditions* or practices of the Church, when an uninterrupted peace thereof ſufficed, and no oppoſition gave occaſion of providing for defence? Indeed when any turbulent and diſobedient ſpirit of contradiction brake out to diſturb the peace and unity of the Church, then the Miniſters diſputed, preached, or wrote, as need required, or Councels were called, which could not come together from divers Nations without much trouble and charge; and therefore they were not aſſembled except in caſe of ſome urgent neceſſity; and then their *Canons* were agreed upon for ſuppreſſing of emergent errors, and that in all reaſon; for what need arming without an enemy? to make Statutes, proviſions, Ordinances or *Canons* without ſome preſent danger, might poſſibly teach men to offend, or erre, who without ſuch occaſion, had not minded it at all. The firſt *Apoſtolical Synod*, had

Celebratum eſt primum Concilium Hieroſolymis. Act. 15. 1. Carranza ſum. concil.

had an apparent cauſe; —— *certain men* —— *taught the brethren*, ſaying, *Except ye be circumciſed, after the manner of* Moſes, *ye cannot be ſaved: Then the Apoſtles and Elders came together to conſider of this matter.* So the four firſt Councels had their ſeveral occaſions. The *Nicen Councel* was called by *Conſtantin*, to ſuppreſs the damnable hereſie of the *Arians*. The *Councel* of *Conſtantinople* was called againſt *Maedonius* and *Eunomius* denying the deity of the holy Ghoſt (in the reigne of *Gratian* and *Theodoſius*.) The *Councel* of *Epheſus* (in the reigne of *Theodoſius* the younger) againſt *Neſtorius* and *Cæleſtius*; and the *Calcedon Councel* was gathered againſt the hereſie of *Eutychus* and *Dioſcorus*: ſo was the *Councel* of *Gangris* againſt *Euſtathius*: The firſt *Councel* of *Carthage* againſt the rebaptizing *Donatiſts*; the *Arelatenſe* was occaſioned by their appeal: and the ſecond *Milevitan Councel* was called againſt *Pelagius* and *Cæleſtius* his great Factor, denying infants original ſin and baptiſm: So that the *non determination* of a thing for many ages in the *Church*, the *Church* conſtantly holding and practiſing it, proves nothing, but that no body oppoſed it all that time; and had *Pelagius*'s hereſie concerning infant-baptiſm, after the *Milevitan Councel*, and after the writings of *Jerome*, *Auguſtin*, *Optatus* and others, ſtill ſlept, I know not why any man ſhould now have written, or ſpoken againſt it.

Quatuor concilia ſuſcipere & venerari me fateor; Nicenum; in quo perverſum Arii dogma deſtruitur. Conſtantinopolitanum —— in quo Eunomii & Maedonii error convincitur. Epheſinum primum, in quo Neſtorii impietas judicatur. Calcedonenſe —— in quo Eutychis Dioſcorique pravitas reprobatur. Gregor. ep. 24. l. 1. *Severin.* Bin. Concil. To. 1. *Carranza. ſum. Concil.*

I grant (you ſay) *it was practiſed in* Africa *before that time, and they or ſome of them thought well of it; and though that be no argument for us to think ſo, yet none of them did ever before pretend it to be neceſſary, none to have been a precept of the Goſpel: St.* Auguſtin *was the firſt that ever preach'd it to be abſolutely neceſſary, and that was in his heat and anger againſt* Pelagius, *who had warmed and chafed him ſo in that queſtion, that it made him innovate in other doctrines poſſibly of more concernment then this.*]

You grant the practice of infant-baptiſm in *Africa*, and that ſome of them *thought well of it.* It hath been proved that an ancient Councel there eſtabliſhed it, as a cuſtome of the Church derived from the practice or tradition of the *Apoſtles*,

Apoſtles, obeying *Chriſt's* general precept to baptize *all nations*: that none of them before *Auguſtin* pretended it to be neceſſary, cannot be true; for they would not have practiſed a thing of ſo high concernment, except they had held it to be neceſſary on the part of the adminiſtrers. Further I ſay that the *Churches* of *Africa* were of a very ancient plantation, as were alſo the Churches of *Aſia*, of which was *Juſtin Martyr*, by birth a *Samaritan*, which is of *Aſia* the greater, and he was for infant-baptiſm; above all controverſie, the ſound of the Apoſtles preaching *went into all the earth, and their words unto the ends of the world*; and therefore all the Chriſtian Churches were firſt planted according to the Goſpel and traditions of the Apoſtles, among which we have ſhewed infant-baptiſm to be one: for good cauſe therefore they thought well of it, and ſo do we. That none of them did ever before *Auguſtine*, pretend it neceſſary, is apparently falſe; for it was in liking and uſe in *Cyprians* time, as hath been proved; therefore if *Auguſtin* were the firſt that ever preached it to be abſolutely neceſſary to ſalvation, and in his heat againſt the *Pelagians* did ſomething innovate, it hurteth not our cauſe; who do not affirm ſo rigid a neceſſity of baptiſm, as we have ſaid formerly. But you ſa

See Rev. 1, 11. *Act.* 19. 10. Σαμαρείτης ἦν τὸ γένος. Epiphan. hær. ef. 46 *See alſo Mr.* Home, c. 13. pag 110. &c. Rom. 10. 18.

——— *Nor at all in other places; we have the teſtimony of a learned Pedobaptiſt* Ludovicus Vives, *who in his annotations upon* S. Auguſtin de. C. Dei l. 1. c. 27. *affirms*, neminem niſi adultum antiquitùs ſolere baptizari.]

That infant-baptiſm was not at all practiſed in other places, is very untrue, as appeareth by that which hath been alleadged out of *Ireneus*, who was of *France*, and *Juſtin Martyr*, *Jerom*, *Ambroſe*, *&c.* That which you cite out of *Ludovicus Vives*, *neminem niſi adultum antiquitùs ſolere baptizari*; I ſuppoſe you may read in ſome index or marginal note, or in *Bellarmin* with a little change; the words of *Vives* in the cited place are ——— *ne quis fallatur hoc loco*; *nemo olim ſacro admovebatur baptiſterio, niſi adultâ jam ætate*, &c. *leſt any ſhould be deceived in this place, none anciently was moved to the ſacred font, but ſuch as were come to full age*, &c. Certainly

Lugdunenſem in Gallia regebat eccleſiam. Catol. ſcriptor. eccleſ. Hieron. To. 1. L. Vives, in Aug. de. C. D. l. 1. c. 27.

tainly *Auguſtin* ſpake there concerning thoſe who being of years, could underſtand what the ſacred myſtery ſignified, and could deſire the ſame: *What is the cauſe* (ſaith he) *why we ſhould ſpend times in exhorting them, wherein by ſpeaking we endeavour to enflame the baptized either unto virgin integrity, or vidual continency, or unto a conjugal fidelity*, &c. he meant not ſuch words to infants. What did *vidual continency*, or *conjugal fidelity* concern infants, as ſuch? and *L. Vives* words immediately following intimate the ſame; *The image of which thing* (ſaith he) *we yet ſee in our baptizing of infants.* If this were not his meaning, as it was *Auguſtins*, it was frivolous enough, and ſuch as I cannot eaſily believe ſo learned an Author, and ſo well acquainted with *Auguſtins* ſenſe, and judgement in this matter could be guilty of; poſſibly his *olim*, related to the baptiſm which was adminiſtred *in eccleſiâ conſtituendâ* (when the partition wall being broken down, and the natural branches broken off, that others might be graffed into Chriſt) which was, and could no otherwiſe be then by inſtructing people in the faith of Chriſt, and then baptizing them, that their children might afterward be baptized, as being within the covenant by their fathers priviledg, and their own, as being children of believing parents; ſo that in the conſtituting a Chriſtian Church, the Miniſters firſt, and moſt general work of adminiſtring baptiſm, was with perſons of years (by their preaching to them) converting to the faith, but *in eccleſiâ conſtitutâ* it is much otherwiſe: our general work of adminiſtration of baptiſm is with infants of enchurched parents; we ſeldom meeting with any *Turk*, or *Pagan*, or *Jew* converted, and deſiring baptiſm; to conclude, if *L. Vives* by you cited, had been of your opinion (to ſpare the mentioning the authority of *Ireneus, Cyprian, Auguſtin, Jerom*, &c. or the *African* or other Councels, who much better knew the cuſtom of the ancient Churches then *Lud. Vives* could) we can ballance *Vives* with *Polydor Virgil*, another

Quid igitur cauſæ eſt, cur eis exhortationibus tempora conſumamus quibus baptizatos alloquendi ſtudeamus accendere, ſive ad virginalem integritatem ſive ad continentiam vidualem, ſive ad ipſam thori conjugalis fidem, &c Aug. de G.D.l.1.c. 27.

Cujus rei imaginem adhuc, in noſtris infantium baptiſmis videmus. L. Viv. loco citato. Eph. 3 14.. Rom. 11.19

Ut autem infantes apud Judæos octavo ab ortu die circumcidebantur, ſic apud nos plurimum baptizantur, quod tamen Angli in ipſo natali die faciunt, id quod divus Cyprianus — multis rationibus eſſe faciendum probat. Polydor. Virg. de invent. l.4.c.4.

learned Author, who ſaith, *As infants among the* Jews *were circumciſed the eight day from their nativity, ſo are they for the moſt part, with us baptized, which yet the* Engliſh *do in the very day wherein they are born, that which S.* Cyprian — *by many reaſons proveth may be done.*

But (you ſay) *beſides that the tradition cannot be proved to be Apoſtolical, we have very good evidence from antiquity, that it was the opinion of the Primitive Church, that infants ought not to be baptized, and this is clear in the ſixt Canon of the Councel of Neocæſarea, &c.*]

It is proved to be Apoſtolical, and therefore (above controverſy) it can be proved: You talk of *very good evidence from antiquity*, that it was the opinion of the Primitive Church, that *infants ought not to be baptized*. and this, you ſay, *is clear in the ſixt Canon of the Councel of Neocæſarea*: ſo then, it is likely that one teſtimony is very good and clear evidence for you; and ſhall not many, and of them, ſome more ancient, witneſſes be good for us? *Origen*, *Ireneus*, *Cyprian*, with the whole Councel of *Carthage*, held about *anno* 258. were more ancient then the Councel of *Neocæſarea* held about the year 316. and thoſe, as hath been ſhewed, were for infant-baptiſm, as many others alſo expreſs. *Auguſtin*, as we have before noted (on *Num.*13) calleth it *eccleſiæ fidem firmiſſimam*, and *fundatiſſimum morem*, *the moſt firm faith of the Church, and the moſt grounded cuſtom.* And again, *that which was delivered by Apoſtolical authority.* But let us now behold how clear it is in the ſixt Canon of the Councel of *Neocæſarea* which you alleadged. The Canon ſaith, *A woman with child may be baptized when ſhe pleaſe; for the baptiſm of her that is to be delivered, in this matter concerneth not the infant to be born, becauſe every ones own choice or purpoſe is manifeſted or declared by his own confeſſion*, the mothers baptiſm doth not ſo concern the infant that is to be born, as if that needed not to be baptized when 'tis born: The woman muſt for the preſent make her confeſſion of faith, whereby ſhe may declare her

Binn. concil. To 1. p. 288. Aug. ep. 28. autoritate Apoſtolicâ traditum. Aug. contra. Donatiſt. l 3. c. 24.

περὶ κυοφορούσης ὅτι δεῖ βαπτίζεσθαι ὁπότε βούλεται, οὐδὲν γὰρ ἐν τούτῳ κοινωνεῖ ἡ πίστωσα τῷ πιστουμένῳ, διὰ τὸ ἑκάστου ἰδίαν τὴν προαίρεσιν πρὸ ἐπὶ τῇ ὁμολογίᾳ δείκνυσθαι. Concil. Neocæſar. cor: 6. Binn. concil. To. 1.

choice;

choice; and ſo muſt the child for his own part, when he comes to age, and can ſhew that he embraceth the Chriſtian faith. Mark how clear this Canon makes it, that *Infants ought not to be baptized.* Here's not one word forbidding infant-baptiſm, the whole ſcope being rather to ſhew that the infant muſt be baptized for himſelf; becauſe the mothers baptiſm (in whoſe womb he then was) cannot excuſe him from being baptized. Add hereto that which ſome obſerve, That regeneration by baptiſm, preſuppoſeth a precedent natural birth, which the unborn child hath not; therefore the unborn infant cannot be regenerate in his mothers baptiſm: Indeed it gives him a right hereto, if he have none by the fathers ſide, 1 *Cor.* 7. 14. So that if any man liſt to think that the Councel ſpake Goſpel; yet it will no more thence follow, that infants ought not to be baptized, becauſe they cannot yet make confeſſion of their faith, then that all that which is ſaid of the *adult*, is preciſely to be applyed to infants for preſent, as that 2. *Theſ.* 3. 10. —— *This We command you, that if any would not work, neither ſhould he eat* —— which concerneth infants no otherwiſe then when they ſhould be able; but in the mean time would you not have them eat? you know that though the rule bear a ſhew of univerſality, yet it concerneth perſons of age and ability, not infants; ſo here, the Miniſters interrogating perſons of years to be baptized, was ſimply neceſſary; for how elſe ſhould it have been known whether they were fit to be admitted into the Church priviledges by baptiſm? that therefore they did not admit infants to baptiſm, becauſe they did not examin them, follows not, except you could ſhew that they admitted none to baptiſm but perſons of years, which is the queſtion in hand, and therefore may not be a *medium* to prove your aſſertion by: as for asking them queſtions to be anſwered by Sponſors, Godfathers and Godmothers, we ſhall ſpeak anon.

Si quæritur an baptizati matre viante in ea unum pars ejus baptizetur, dicendum eſt quod non, ut dicit Auguſtinus contra Iulian. ſec. Gabriel. Biel in 4. ſent. diſt. 4 q 2.

Nemo poteſt renaſci niſi prius naſcatur. Gerard. de baptiſm. fol. 606. ſin.

—— *Quandoquidem non poteſt quis renaſci niſi prius naſcatur,* Alex. Alenſis part. 4 de ſacr. baptiſm. q. 8. m 7. a. 1. reſol.

And to ſupply their incapacity by the anſwer of a Godfather, is but the ſame unreaſonableneſs acted with a worſe circumſtance: and there is no ſenſible account to be given of it.]

We ſay that by your preſent confeſſion, ſuch ſponſion by God-fathers is but a circumſtance; therefore the ſponſors ſupply not any incapacity of infants in the reſpect of the ſubſtance of baptiſm, which is to be ſprinkled, waſhed with, or dipped in water, in the name of the Father, the Son, and the holy Ghoſt: for this their own capacity is ſufficient (they being born of believing parents, and within the Church) without the ſupply of any anſwer of others for them; which if you grant us, we have the end of our diſpute; as for circumſtances, neither commanded nor forbidden by God in the holy ſcriptures, we ſhall willingly ſubmit to the authority and practice of the Church in which we live: If you diſpute from the circumſtance, or any pretended inconvenience therein, to the anulling the ſubſtance controverted, you know how unreaſonable that *fallacia accidentis* is; and *what ſenſible account can be given of it?* But you ſay.

That which ſome imperfectly murmur concerning ſtipulations civil performed by Tutors in the name of their Pupils, is an abſolute vanity, &c.]

Have a care that you be not anſwered with *à turpe eſt Doctori, &c.* Do you not vainly argue, that in the uſe of God-fathers, *&c.* God is tyed, and Chriſtian Religion tranſacts her myſteries by proportion and compliance with the Law of the *Romans*; concerning which ſomething hath been anſwered before; I only add here, that God neither commanding nor forbidding God-fathers, it is no vanity to obey authority herein: But to diſturb the peace of the Church, and make ſchiſmes for things in their own nature indifferent, and commended to us by venerable antiquity, is not only vain, but impious: And how is God tyed, where he neither forbids nor commands? To the reſt we ſay not that *Chriſtian Religion muſt tranſact her myſteries by complyance with* Roman *Laws*, or humane cuſtoms; but that in ſome things ſhe may, in things circumſtantial, and no waies repugnant to the word of God. You ſay further,

Ad num. 16. pag. 231.

I know God might, if he would, have appointed God-fathers

pag 239.

to

to give anſwer in behalf of children, and to be ſideiuſſors for them, but we cannot find any authority or ground that he hath; and if he had, then it is to be ſuppoſed he would have given them commiſſion to have tranſacted the ſolemnity with better circumſtances, and given anſwers with more truth.]

We anſwer 1. In that you can find no authority or ground for it, nor againſt it, as we know it can be no other then *adiaphorous*, or indifferent, and in or for ſuch things as are meerly circumſtantial, and in their own nature indifferent to diſſent from antiquity; diſobey the Churches authority, and break the ſacred band of unity, let your own conſciences tell you what you do.

2. Whereas you would beſpatter this cuſtom of imputation of will-worſhip and untruth in the uſers thereof; I ſay firſt, That whatſoever God hath commanded or forbidden in holy Scriptures, that is neceſſarily to be obſerved; and this faithfull word we muſt hold faſt, Tit. 1.9. But thoſe things which he hath neither commanded nor forbidden, neither expreſly, nor by neceſſary conſequence, fall under the general rule belonging to things arbitrary and indifferent, *Let all things be done decently and in order*, 1 Cor. 14. 40. which then only can be when we unanimouſly and uniformly do that which a general conſent and conſtant practice of the Church warranteth; not that which every private ſpirit liketh or diſliketh: There can be no decency without order, nor order in confuſion of practices: therefore God having left many things circumſtantial, arbitrary as to the authority of the Church, we ought to tender her unity, and reverence her authority; the contempt whereof hath opened ſo wide a dore to ſchiſm as now troubleth the Chriſtian world. Secondly, there may be falſhood in ſome mens anſwers, though no fault in the order which God will, it being his perfection that he is ὁ ἀψευδὴς Θεὸς; *God that cannot lie*, Tit. 1. 2. and it is the inviolable holyneſs of his will, that he will not, neither can will any evil; and it is certainly true which *Fulgentius* ſaith, *As there is no ſin in him, ſo there is no ſin of him.*

Sicut ergo peccatum in eo non eſt, ita peccatum ex eo non eſt. Fulgent. de præ. deſt. ad Monim. l. 1.

For

For the queſtion (you ſay) *is asked of believing in the preſent; and if the God-fathers anſwer in the name of the child* (I do believe) *it is notorious* that they *ſpeak falſe and ridiculouſly; for the infant is not capable of believing, &c.*]

Quis autem neſciat credere eſſe infantibus baptizari. Aug de peccat. mer. & rem. l. 1. c. 27.

——*Ipſi portantur ad eccleſiam, etſi pedibus illuc currere non poſſunt, alienis pedibus currunt ut ſanentur: accommodat illis mater eccleſia aliorum pedes ut veniant, aliorum cor ut credant, aliorum linguam ut fateantur, ut quoniam quòd ægri ſunt alio peccante prægravantur, ſic cum hi ſani ſunt alio pro eis confitente ſalvantur.* Auguſtin. de verb. Apoſt. ſerm. 10.

For anſwer, we may ſay with *Auguſtin*, Who knows not, that to be baptized, is in, or for infants, inſtead of believing? And again, they are borne to Church, and although they cannot run thither on their own feet, yet go they on others feet, that they may be healed: our mother the Church lendeth them others feet, that they may come, others heart that they may believe, others tongue that they may confeſs, that for as much as in that they are ſick, they are more grievouſly burthened with anothers ſin (that is, which they acted not in their own perſons) ſo when theſe are cured, they may be healed or ſaved, another confeſſing for them. But I demand, Why may we not here with better reaſon underſtand *preſent*, for *future believing*, then you do children of believers. holyneſs, which the Apoſtle, 1 *Cor.* 7. 14. pronounceth in the preſent) *by a deſignation to the ſervice of Jeſus Chriſt, and the future participation of the promiſes*?

But *Auguſtin* ſaith very well, — "If the Sacraments "had not a certain ſimilitude of thoſe things whereof they "are Sacraments, they ſhould not at all be Sacraments; "but by reaſon of this likeneſs, they oftentimes receive the "very names of theſe things themſelves; therefore as af- "ter a certain manner, the Sacrament of Chriſts body is

pag. 233, 234. Num. 20.

Si enim ſacramenta quandam ſimilitudinem earum rerum quarum ſacramenta ſunt non haberent, omnino ſacramenta non eſſent: ex hac autem ſimilitudine plerumque etiam ipſarum rerum nomina accipiunt; ſicut ergo ſecundum quendam modum, ſacramentum corporis Chriſti, corpus Chriſti eſt, ſacramentum ſanguinis Chriſti, ſanguis Chriſti eſt, ita ſacramentum fidei, fides eſt; nihil autem eſt aliud credere, quam fidem habere, ac per hoc, cum reſpondetur parvulum credere, qui fidei nondum habet affectum, reſpondetur fidem habere propter fidei ſacramentum, & convertere ſe ad Deum propter converſionis ſacramentum, quia & ipſa reſponſio ad celebrationem pertinet ſacramenti; ſicut de ipſo baptiſmo Apoſtolus; Conſepulti, inquit, ſumus Chriſto per baptiſmum in mortem: non ait ſepulturam ſignificamus, ſed prorſus ait, conſepulti ſumus: ſacramentum ergo tantæ rei, non niſi ejuſdem rei vocabulo nuncupavit. Itaque parvulum, etſi nondum fides illa, quæ in credentium voluntate conſiſtit, jam tamen ipſius fidei ſacramentum fidelem facit: nam ſicut credere reſpondetur, ita etiam fidelis vocatur, non rem ipſa mente annuendo, ſed ipſius rei ſacramentum percipiendo. Auguſtin. ep. 23. Bonifac.

"the

" the body of Christ; the Sacrament of Christs blood, is the " blood of Christ; so the Sacrament of faith, is faith: Now " to believe, is nothing else but to have faith; and so when " 'tis answered that the infant believeth, who hath not yet " the affection of faith; we answer, that he hath faith in " respect of the sacrament of faith; and that he conver- " teth to God, in respect of the sacrament of conversion; " because even that very answer appertaineth unto the ce- " lebration of the Sacrament; as the Apostle speaketh of " baptism it self; We are, saith he, *Buried with him by bap-* " *tism into death*; he saith not, we signifie burial, but altoge- " ther saith, *We are buried* — therefore he called the Sa- " crament of so great a matter, by no other name then of " the thing it self: So that faith, though it be not yet such " as consisteth in the will of believers, yet the very Sacra- " ment of that faith, makes a (baptized) infant faithfull, " or a believer: For as 'tis answered that he believeth, so " is he called a believer; not signifying that thing in the " very mind, but in respect of his receiving the Sacrament " of that very thing; to wit, of believing, and giving his " name to Christ.

But what *unreasonableness acted with a worse circumstance*, is there for God-fathers thus answering——*All this I steadfastly believe* (wherein though possibly there may be untruth, because the Sponsor doth not as he professeth, steadfastly believe, yet so may there also be, when persons of years answer for themselves, that they believe) seeing the lawfulness of baptizing infants, is affirmed on condition of their parents believing, and Church-priviledge, which is often testified personally by the very parents, Grand-fathers, Grand-mothers, and sometimes in defect, or necessary absence of such, by some fellow-believers testifying for them, and the childs priviledg and baptism: but your *sensible account* is, that they speak *false and ridiculously*; if you can bear the *eccho* of your own words, we therein answer you; yet for the sober readers sake, we further

Cum patrini respondent credo, sensus est, puerum ad credendum & me obligo. &c. Alex. Alens. par. 4. q. 7. m. 3. a. 1. resol. *Baptismus confertur publicè in cœtu Christianorum, quorum testimonium non potest repudiari: eodem fine adhibentur patrini, tanquam testes baptismi, &c.* Ioh. Gerard de s. baptis. class. 4. 164. —— *adhibentur veluti rei gestæ testes.* Polydor. Virgil. de invent. l. 4. c. 4.

answer,

anſwer after *Auguſtin*, treating of the ſame argument, *Let no man whiſper to you other doctrines; this the Church ever had, ever held, &c.* doubtleſs the cuſtom is very ancient; Hiſtories tell us of it in the time of *Higinus*, who was coetaneous with *Polycarp* a diſciple of S *Johns*, they lived under the reigne of *Antoninus Pius*, about the year 140. ſome think it came into the Church from the cuſtom of thoſe who were Catechumeniſts, who being examined before they were admitted to baptiſm, concerning their faith and repentance, were not only to anſwer in their own perſons, but to have ſponſors as witneſſes of their faith, converſion, and baptiſm. It is not improbable which ſome here propoſe, that—As children were baptized when their Chriſtian parents had formerly made confeſſion; ſo ſureties confeſſed in relation to themſelves, that they might be fit to ſtand as a kind of parents, *&c.* Seeing therefore this cuſtom is nothing repugnant to holy ſcripture, neither hath in it any appearance of evil, but rather of profit and edification, though it be not of the eſſence of baptiſm, but a ceremonial circumſtance, 'tis fooliſh and impious to quarrel it, and for it to break unity and diſturb the peace of the Church. But you ſay,

Nemo ergo vobis ſuſurrat doctrinas alienas, hoc eccleſia ſemper habuit, ſemper tenuit, &c. Aug. de verb. Apoſt. Serm. 11.

——*Voluit item unum ſaltem patrimum, unamque matrimam baptiſmo intereſſe ſic enim eos appellant qui infantes tenent, dum baptizantur; hujus quoque temporis fuit Polycarpus Johannis Apoſtoli diſcipulus*—— *Platina de vit. Pont. Teleſph. & Higin.* —— *mentio patrimorum fit apud Dionyſ. Areopag. Hierarch. Eccleſ. c. 2. Tertul. de bapt. c. 18. Euſeb. l. 7. c. 20. vid. Polydor. Virgil. de invent. l. 4. c. 4. Hugo de S. Victor.* part. 6. c. 12.

Mr. Homes *animadverſ. upon Mr.* Tombes *Exerc. c. 14. pag. 181.*

pag. 239. ——*The infant is not capable of believing, and if he were, he were alſo capable of diſſenting; and how then do they know his mind?*]

If it be neceſſary to baptiſm that the baptizer know the mind of the perſon to be baptized, how can you baptize men of years? You will ſay they expreſs their minds, and ſo we baptize them. I grant you may know their words, their minds you cannot; becauſe they may diſſemble. If you ſay you are in charity to believe the beſt; once more we ſay, Be but as charitable towards infants, of whom you can know no actual evil, nor ſhew any juſt cauſe why you ſhould ſuſpect it for the future. And I pray how could the

the Prieſt under the Law know the minds of children to be circumciſed? To conclude, 'tis nothing material whether we know the infants mind, 'tis behoofull that we know his priviledg, as being born within the Church and Covenant of God, which giveth him a ſufficient right to the ſeals thereof. But you ſay,

Tertullian *gives advice that baptiſm of infants ſhould be deferred till they could give account of their faith.*]

I anſwer, 1. *Tertullian* ſpeaking of deferring baptiſm, leſt they ſhould raſhly give it, as to perſons out of the Covenant, or unbelievers, inſtanceth ſpecially children; that is, *extraneorum, non fœderatorum*, as the learned *Fra. Iunius* interpreteth the ſame: ſo that this concerneth not our preſent queſtion which is of children of Chriſtians. 2. This ſhews then that the practice of infant-baptiſm was none of *Auguſtins* device, as you charge him, ſeeing it was in uſe in the time of *Tertullian*. 3. But let us hear the reſt of *Tertullians* advice; was it only concerning the deferring infants baptiſm? Let them come when they can learn, when they are taught whither they come, let them be made Chriſtians when they ſhall be able to know Chriſt —— nay but preſently he ſaith, *For no leſs cauſe the unmarried alſo are to be delayed, in whom the tentation is prepared, both in virgins by their maturity, and widows by their going up and down untill they are either married or confirmed in conſtancy* —— Will you follow *Tertullians* advice herein? But what if they never marry, muſt they never be baptized? If not, give us leave to decline it in the other, or to take it in the ſenſe he meaneth it, as may appear in that he ſpecifieth widows, who being at that age, are neceſſarily to be ſuppoſed either baptized after their firſt marriage, or out of the Covenant.

Veniant ergo dum adoleſcunt, veniant dum diſcunt, dum quo veniant docentur, fiant Chriſtiani quum Chriſtum noſſe potuerint —— non minore de cauſâ innupti quoque procraſtinandi, in quibus tentatio præparata eſt tam virginibus per maturitatem, quàm viduis per vagationem, donec aut nubant, aut continentiâ corroborentur, &c *Tertul. de bapt.* c. 18.

And the ſame (you ſay) *is alſo the Councel of* Gregory *Biſhop of* Nazianzum, &c.

Καὶ πᾶς ἔσω σοὶ καιρὸς τῦ βαπτίσματος ὅρος ——— νήπιον ἔστι σοι μὴ λαβέτω καιρὸν ἡ κακία. ἐκ βρέφους ἁγιασθήτω, ἐξ οἰνύχων καθιερωθήτω. τῷ πνεύματι, συ δεδοικας τὸν σφαγίδα, &c. Greg. Nazian. Orat. 40. ib ip tis unguiculis ſpiritu conſecretur.

Gregory Nazianzen in his fortieth Oration (which you cite in your margent) ſaith, Sow when the time of ſowing is ——plant prune thy vine when the ſeaſon is, &c. But at all times intend thy ſalvation, and think that any time is ſeaſonable, or appointed for baptiſm: among other ages of man be inſtanceth in Infancy. Haſt thou an Infant (ſaith he) let not wickedneſs take away the occaſion, let it be ſanctified from its infancy, let it be dedicated to the Spirit from it tender years: feareſt thou the ſeal in reſpect of the infirmity of Nature? How poor a ſpirited mother art thou, and of how little faith? But *Anna* promiſed *Samuel* unto the Lord before he was born, &c. You ſay concerning *Gr. Nazianzen*, that his reaſon taught him that which was fit, (true, for he allowed Infant-baptiſm) yet he was over-born with ——— the opinion of his Age, &c. So far alſo I conſent as this relates to that they thought, that Infants dying without Baptiſme, ſhould neither be glorified nor puniſhed. That which you further ſay, *although he allowed them to haſten in caſe of neceſſity*, falleth under a double conſideration: Firſt, in reſpect of thoſe times appointed for Baptiſm in the primitive Church, to wit, *Eaſter*, and *Whitſontide*, or *Pentecoſt*, which he mentioneth: But when he cometh to the queſtion, whether Infants ſhould be baptized, he anſwereth poſitively; *By all means*, if any danger urge, and ſheweth it from the Analogy between Circumciſion and Baptiſm. He taketh away the objection from the years at which Chriſt was baptized, which was indeed to be deferred untill the fulneſs of time for the worlds redemption was come: and that we are not to imitate all the actions of Chriſt. To that which you ſay ——

Τὰς δὲ μήτε δόξας ἡσυχάσαι, μήτε κόλας ἡσυχάσαι, &c. ib. Greg. Naz.

Πάντα γε εἴπερ τις κίνδυνος. ib. part. poſt.

Yet in another place he makes mention of ſome to whom Baptiſm was not adminiſtred, διὰ νηπιότητα, by reaſon of Infancy; we ſay you utterly miſtake: for *Nazianzen* in the ſame Oration ſpeaking of delay in performance of that duty, reckons up ſeverall ſorts of thoſe whoſe Baptiſm was deferred; ſome for ſloth, or inſatiable deſire of ſinning; others are not in ability to receive it, either for their infancy, or ſome ſudden and violent accident, diſabling them

οἱ δὲ οὐδὲ εἰσὶν ἐν δυνάμει τῦ δέξασθαι ἢ διὰ νηπιότητα συλλ, &c.

them ſo that they cannot receive this grace if they would. True, infants have neither ability nor will to come to Baptiſm; nor can thoſe (though of years) who are accidentally diſabled: they have not power, though they have a will to come. What is this to our deferring Infants Baptiſm in the Rule, which in ſome caſes may reaſonably and lawfully be done. As for example, Suppoſe an infant neer ſome *Mahumetan* border were found, and the parents not known, we may and ought to demur. But what makes this againſt baptizing infants of parents known to be within the Church? But you ſay,

To which if we add that the parents of S. Auguſtine, *S.* Hierom, *and St.* Ambroſe, *although they were Chriſtian, yet did they not baptize their children before they were* 30 *years of age, it will be very conſiderable in the Example, and of great efficacy for the deſtroying the ſuppoſed neceſſity or derivation from the Apoſtles.*

This may make a formidable noyſe in ſome vulgar ear; 'tis true which Mr. *Homes* notes, pag. 188. that the opinions or practices of ſome few, conclude no more againſt the generall tenet and practice of the Church, then the Hills and Vallies do againſt the roundneſs of the world. But to what purpoſe do you propoſe any of theſe examples to your clients imitation? If not, why inferre you them? Poſſibly the parents of ſome great and excellent men, might erre in ſuch omiſſion of duty; or there might be ſome invincible lets or obſtructions to their deſires: however you would not have your childrens Baptiſm deferred 30 years. To the particulars I ſay, *Poſſidonius* in the life of *Auguſtine*, ſaith, that he was born of honeſt and Chriſtian parents, and that he received of St. *Ambroſe*, Biſhop of *Milan*, both the wholeſome doctrine of the *Catholick Church*, and the Divine Sacraments. But *Auguſtine* ſaith, he believed and deſired baptiſm from his childhood; the cauſe of

A non facto ad non jus faciendi, non valet argumentum.

Et Aug. retract. l. 1. c. 6.

Aug. Confeſſ. l. 1. c. 11. his words are theſe, — *Vidiſti Domine cum adhuc puer eſſem, & quodam die preſſus ſtomachi dolore, repentè æſtuarem pœnè moriturus, vidiſti Deus meus — quo motu animi, & quâ fide baptiſmum Chriſti tui — flagitavi à pietate matris meæ, & matris omnium noſtrum eccleſiæ tuæ — dilata eſt itaque mundati mea — ita jam credebam, & illa, & omnis domus, niſi pater ſolus, qui tamen non evicto in me jus maternæ pietatis quo minus in Chriſtum crederem, ſicut ille nondum credidert. t*

See *Auguſtin.* confeſſ. l 3. c. 11. *Fieri enim non poteſt ut filius iſtarum lachrymarum pereat,* lb. c 12. *Ab his domi diligenter inſtitutus unà cum Bonoſo inter ipſos ſtatim parentum amplexus, & nutricum blanditias Chriſtum imbibit, ac mox Chriſtianæ pietatis rudimentis imbutus, &c.* Eraſm. in vit. D. Hieron.

the delay thereof he putteth on a ſudden great ſickneſs, and his fathers unbelief: but if the parents were then Chriſtian when he was born, and either underſtood not, or neglected his Baptiſm, what is this to our cauſe? I know nothing hence following but that, if ſo they neglected, they were culpable. We read of his dangerous eſtate while he was a *Maniche*, and his mothers conſtant and importunate tears and interceſſion for his converſion, as her ſorrow for the delay thereof; which at laſt happily obtained, according to that which the Prelate anſwered her, It cannot be that the ſon of thoſe tears ſhould periſh. After his converſion he ſeriouſly learned, and happily taught others, not to defer infant-baptiſm, as may appear by that which hath been alledged out of him.

As for St. *Hierom*, they alſo ſay that both his parents were Chriſtian, and that he was diligently taught and brought up of them at home, and that with *Bonoſus* preſently even in his Parents embraces, and Nurſe s gentle language he received in Chriſt, and preſently he was inſtructed in the rudiments of Chriſtian piety, which very probably importeth his infant-baptiſme, rather then that he had any Nurſes at his being 30 years old. That which *Eraſmus* (who gathered his ſtory out of other Authors) after ſaith on *Hieroms* Epiſtle to *Damaſus*, that he would follow the faith of that Citie in which he had received the garment of Chriſt, as the ſame *Eraſmus* gives the ſenſe in the life of *Hierom*, proves not that he was not baptized before he was 30 years old: for *Hieroms* words are to this ſenſe, becauſe the *Eaſtern Churches* have rent the ſeamleſs Coat of Chriſt (by their ſchiſmes) ſo that it is hard there to know where the Church is, therefore I thought it meet that I ſhould conſult with *Peters* Chaire, and the faith commended by the Apoſtles mouth (Rom. 1.) thence now requiring food for my ſoul, where long ſince I tooke on me the garment of Chriſt. What was it which he called *Peters* Chair? What the Citie of *Rome?* Was that faith which the Apoſtle commended onely there, or then when *Hierom* wrote in all the *Weſtern Church?* his words concerning

Ejus urbis fidem velle ſequi, in qua Chriſti veſtem accepiſſet. Eraſm. f. 1.

ning the Eaſtern Churches diviſions by reaſon of the *Arian* faction, and the following, concerning the great diſtance at which *Hierom* (being then in *Syria*, near *Antioch*) was, make it plain, that he ſpake of the Weſtern Church in which he was baptized, probably *in oppido Stridonis*, where he was born, not in *Rome*: As for *Eraſmus's* opinion of his being baptized in *Rome*, 'tis grounded but upon an *opinor. I think* (ſaith he) *he meaneth it not of his Prieſthood*, or orders. And what ſolidity is there on theſe conjectures, to conclude that *Hieroms* parents, though Chriſtian, defer'd his baptiſm until he was 30 years old? or what wil it advantage you if it were true? there may be ſuch lets to ſealing, as to *Iſrael* in the Wilderneſs, and God bare with them 40 years together, yet they ſhould have circumciſed the male children at eight dayes old upon a ſevere penalty, *Gen.* 17. 14. an inevitable neceſſity varieth not the rule.

Concerning the laſt inſtance in *Ambroſe*, I find that his Father was Deputy, or Governor of *France*; but whether Chriſtian or not, I find nothing in *Paulinus* who wrote his life, and you avouch no Author for that you ſay. We read that after he was choſen Biſhop of *Milan*, after *Auxentius* the *Arian*, by the joynt ſuffrages of the diſcordant parties; and being (though much againſt his own will) confirmed in that charge by *Valentinian* the Emperor, he was baptized; and with the Church held Infant-baptiſm againſt *Pelagius* and the *Donatiſts*, upon this ground, *Becauſe every age is ſubject to ſin*, therefore *every age is fit for the Sacrament*; let the reader mark how this alſo *is very conſiderable in the example*, and of what *great efficacy it is for the deſtroying the ſuppoſed neceſſity, or derivation from the Apoſtles*, as the pleader ſaith: But ſeeing he can raiſe no ſtronger batteries againſt it, he might more eaſily and certainly conclude, that it will ſtand whether he will or no.

Paulinus vit. D. Ambroſ.

Nec ſenex ergo proſelytus, nec infans vernaculus excipitur, quia omnis ætas peccato obnoxia, & ideo omnis ætas ſacramento idonea —— *ni quis renatus fuerit ex aqua & Sp. S. &c. itaque nullam non infantem, &c.* Ambroſ. Abra. l. 2. c. 11. vid. ib. l. 10. &c. 84 ad Demetriadem. pag. 239. Num. 28. pag. 240.

But however (ſaith he) *it is againſt the perpetual analogie of Chriſtian Doctrine to baptize infants*].

This is gallantly ſpoken, if he could tell how to prove it, or any part thereof.

Beſides

Beſides that Chriſt never gave any precept to baptize them, &c.]

This is his Argument; all that for which Chriſt never gave any precept for the doing it, and which neither himſelf nor his Apoſtles (that appears) did, *is againſt the perpetual Analogie of Chriſts Doctrine; but Chriſt never gave any precept to baptize them*, &c. *ergo*.— I anſwer, This foundred-Argument, lame on both feet, doth poorly charge: 1. 'Tis not true that all is againſt the perpetual Analogie of Chriſts Doctrine for which no expreſs precept of Chriſt, or practice of himſelf or his Apoſtles appears; for there are many things circumſtantial and indifferent, neither commanded nor forbidden, which yet on ſecond thoughts you will not ſay are *againſt the perpetual Analogie of Chriſts Doctrine*: I might inſtance the poſtures, or numbers, or ſexes, or places where, in the receiving the Lords Supper: Where do you read of any command of Chriſt, or practice of himſelf or Apoſtles, that the Communicants ſhould ſtand, or ſit, or kneel, or lie down; one of theſe (or if you can think of any other) muſt needs be; ſhew us either precept or practice obliging to either; where is any precept of Chriſt obliging to a ſet or determined number of Communicants: where are we commanded to adminiſter to women? where is any precept obliging to a place? who knows not that theſe and the like things are left under the general rule, *Let all things be done decently, and in order?* which obſerved they are not againſt the *Analogie of Chriſts Doctrine*. Again, what think you of the Sabath, is that which we now doe therein againſt the *Analogie of Chriſts Doctrine*, becauſe we find no expreſs precept or practice of Chriſt or his Diſciples for the tranſlation of it? That it is and ought to be the Chriſtian Sabbath, is grounded on neceſſary conſequence, but no expreſs precept. 2. It is alſo notoriouſly falſe, that Chriſt never gave any expreſs precept to baptize all Nations, without any exception to infants within the Covenant; and who knoweth not that infants ever were and are a great part of every Nation; what then? though

though he never ſaid in ſo many ſyllables, or by naming infants, go and baptize them alſo, is it not ſufficient to name all Nations without enumeration of particulars? Indeed he needed not give ſuch an expreſs command concerning children, ſeeing that he ſent them to adminiſter this ſeal of the new Covenant and Sacrament of initiation, who were in the old, their ſelves ſealed in their infancy by circumciſion, and ſo uſed to that Doctrine of childrens being within the Covenant with believing parents, and the daily practice of their initiation and reception into the communion of a viſible Church, that it might have ſeemed very ſuperfluous to ſay any more then *Go baptize all Nations.* There is alſo much difference, *Inter eccleſiam conſtituendam, & conſtitutam*; the Apoſtles buſineſs was generally to baptize Heathens and converted unbelievers; but we have to deal with a Church conſtituted; therefore faith and repentance, were ſo often mentioned in the ſtory of the Apoſtles practice; but we living in a ſetled Church, have to deal with baptizing infants who cannot yet actually believe or repent: But in that no particulars are mentioned in Chriſts univerſal command to baptize, it ſheweth that all within the Church-privileg and Covenant of God are included. Again, whereas you require a command *in terminis* for baptizing infants, I demand, Where doth he *in terminis* ſay, Baptize men of years, or Kings, peaſants, rich, poor, high, low, men, women, Citizens, Countrey-men, Fiſhers, Husbandmen, Threſhers, Shooemakers, Taylors, Shop-keepers, or Mechanicks? He commandeth that all be baptized, of what ſex, age, condition or eſtate whatſoever they be, which appertain to any Nation. So in general Preſcripts, Laws, Grants, and Franchiſes, the reherſal of particulars is not requiſite; becauſe ſuch things paſs on the whole kind therein contained, and will that the cenſure or priviledg concern all particulars within that general, except in caſe of any exemption of ſome ſpecified particular, or exception made by him who made the Covenant, or granted the Priviledges. We cannot find κατὰ τὸ ῥητὸν, in theſe very words in any place

Urſin. par. 2.

See Mr. *Cobbet* of childrens baptiſmal right. f. 8. pag. 143.

of

Jo. Gerard. de baptiſm. ſect. 3, de pædobapt. 192.
Matt. 28. 19.
Mat. 26. 26, 27.

of Scripture, *Baptize Women*, or adminiſter the Lords Supper to women yet from theſe general precepts, *Baptize all Nations* — *take eat, this is my body* — and — *drink ye all of it* (now it is — evident that the twelve Apoſtles only were then preſent when he inſtituted this Sacrament, and that he ſpake and adminiſtred it unto them only, yet I ſay we all, without quarrel about it, baptize women, and reſpectively adminiſter the Lords Supper to them, as included in the general precepts; and why are we not contented with a general precept including childrens baptiſm, ſeeing no exception of the Covenant-maker can appear to the contrary? Laſtly we ſay again, that the reaſon why Chriſt gave his Diſciples no expreſs or peculiar command concerning baptizing infants, but included them in the general, was becauſe the Apoſtles were ſo well acquainted with childrens reception into the Church-priviledges, and ſealing into the ſame, that they could not reaſonably make any queſtion of baptizing infants, having a general command to baptize all Nations, infants being under the Law circumciſed; and knowing moreover that the grace of God was not more ſtrict or reſtrained in the new Teſtament then in the old; but contrarywiſe, more diffuſed or large; and therefore a greater and more difficult queſtion might have been concerning the baptiſm of women, there being neither analogie from circumciſion, nor particular precept to induce them to baptize them; but that they knew that the general precept was authority ſufficient, without ſpecifying particulars *in terminis*. You ſay more,

——*Cum gratia Dei non ſit ſtrictior & auguſtior in novo quam in V. T.* Jo. Gerard. S. S.

All that either he or his Apoſtles ſaid concerning it, requires ſuch previous diſpoſitions to baptiſm, of which infants are not capable, and theſe are faith and repentance]

Your whole ſcope is fallacious: form your Argument,

Chriſt and his Apoſtles in all that he or they ſaid concerning baptiſm, required faith and repentance, as previous diſpoſitions to baptiſm, but no infant can believe or repent; *ergo*, infants are not previouſly diſpoſed to, or capable of baptiſm, according to that Chriſt or his Apoſtles

ever

ever ſaid. 1. We ſay here is a *Paralogiſm* or fallacy, *à dicto ſecundum quid ad dictum ſimpliciter*; Your Major is true, if you ſpeak of perſons of years to be inſtructed; but falſe concerning children, becauſe he never requireth any impoſſibility. 2. He that appointed Infants baptiſm, requires no other previous diſpoſition to infant-baptiſm, but ſuch as they are capable of, that is, of being admitted into the viſible Church, and ſealed with the external Seal thereof into the future profeſſion of faith and repentance. Adde hereto that children under the Goſpel, are thus capable of the ſeal of faith, as children were under the Law, although they cannot actually repent or believe, which were and are no leſs previous diſpoſitions, if we ſpeak of perſons of mature years to be baptized: But if your diſpute be κατὰ τὸ αὐτὸ, your *ignoratio elenchi* may not paſs for current reaſon, if by previous diſpoſitions to baptiſm of men of years, you would obtrude the ſame on infants, concerning whom we ſay that actual faith or repentance are no more *previous diſpoſitions to baptiſm*, then they were to circumciſion. And ſo you ſee that I might reaſonably anſwer all that you ſay herein by rejecting your conſequence; but for the prudent Readers further ſatisfacton, I ſay, 3. *A previous diſpoſition* neceſſary to the capacity of a thing, is conſiderable, either as it is *in* or *of* the ſubject.

1. *A previous diſpoſition in the ſubject*, we may underſtand either as a ſelf-diſpoſing by ſome intrinſecal and inward faculty, or as a being extrinſecally diſpoſed and fitted by ſome other power, to a capacity or receptibility of ſomething which yet it hath not, neither was capable thereof before ſuch a diſpoſition: Now this in our preſent inſtance preſuppoſeth, or ſpeaks ſome change of the mind by illumination, faith, remorſe of conſcience, purpoſe of leading a new life, and deſire to be implanted into Chriſt and the communion of Saints by baptiſm; and ſo it is internal; or profeſſing of that endeavour of knowing the myſteries of the Goſpel, faith and repentance teſtified before men; and ſo theſe diſpoſitions are external,

or expreſſed to men whom it may concern; theſe are neceſſary in perſons of years coming to baptiſm.

2. there is a previous diſpoſition of the ſubject without any preſent change of the mind, which ſpringeth from his relation to ſome other, or ſome others act: So ſome titles of honour come on children in their fathers Charters without any preſent change of the childs mind; ſo Lands and Inheritances, by right of adoption, may be ſetled on them in their infancy, without their preſent change or knowledg; ſo alſo the believing parents priviledg, and being within Gods Covenant made with them and their children, previouſly diſpoſeth infants to the ſeal thereof, to wit, by giving them a certain right thereto, and ſo was it in circumciſion: But if a Proſelyte were to receive the ſeal of the Covenant, he muſt neceſſarily be prepared and firſt diſpoſed thereto, by the knowledg of Gods Law and Covenant, faith, repentance, or at leaſt the profeſſion thereof, and thoſe other rites which the Law required on that behalf. The infants previous diſpoſition to circumciſion, was no other then his fathers and his own priviledg, and being within Gods Covenant: Of the child was neither faith nor repentance required for the preſent, but future; ſo muſt we underſtand concerning baptiſm, the ſeal of faith under the Goſpel.

And not (ſay you) *to inſtance in thoſe innumerable places that require faith before this Sacrament, there needs no more but this one, He that believeth and is baptized ſhall be ſaved* —]

I anſwer, 1. Deal fairly, diſpute *ad idem*; and ſhew me one place of Scripture which univerſally requireth faith before this Sacrament, and you ſhall be excuſed for the *innumerable places* which you ſpeak of: We can ſhew that the rule holds not univerſally that faith muſt precede the Sacraments: for though *Abrahams* faith preceded the ſeal thereof, yet *Iſaaks* ſeal preceded his faith: Mr. *Calvin* expreſſeth the reaſon hereof: "Why (ſaith he) doth "in *Abraham* the Sacrament follow faith, and in *Iſaak* his

" his ſon it goeth before all underſtanding? becauſe it " is meet that he, which being in full-grown age is recei- " ved into fellowſhip of the Covenant, from which he " had hitherto been a ſtranger, ſhould firſt learn the con- " ditions thereof: but an infant begotten of him, need- " ed not ſo, which by right of inheritance, according " to the form of the promiſe, is even from his mothers " womb contained in the Covenant. And certainly in this reſpect God calleth the infants of covenanted parents, ſons and daughters born unto him, *Ezek.* 16. 20. & 23. 37. be eſteeming them his children who are born of thoſe parents to whom God made the promiſe to be *a God unto them and their ſeed after them*; which promiſe as truly concerns us and our children, as it concerned *Abraham* and his. Gen. 17. 7. Act. 2. 39. &c. 2 Cor. 6. 18.

2. If the argument be good from that place, *Mark* 16. 16. *He that believeth and is baptized*; faith is firſt named, and then baptiſm: ergo, faith muſt precede baptiſm: Why ſhall not the Argument from other places be good to the contrary? as *John* 3:5. *Except a man be born of water and of the ſpirit, he cannot enter into the Kingdom of God*: Baptiſm is firſt named, and then regeneration; therefore baptiſm muſt precede regeneration. So again *Epheſ.* 5. 26. *Waſhing with water*, that is, baptiſm is mentioned before the word, *ergo*, we muſt firſt be baptized, and afterward receive the word. 3. If this argument were good, how many men and women of age, muſt by the ſame reaſon be denyed baptiſm? For all have not faith; but the truth is, that to be born in the Church, is unto, or in infants inſtead of profeſſion of faith and repentance, as to the outward ſeal, for which we contend; and profeſſion of faith and repentance, is to and for the *adult* inſtead of the ſame, for their right to the deſired ſeal (ſo was it to *Iſmael*, and *Eſau* whom God hated) becauſe they were born of covenanted parents. 4. Sure it is that Chriſt in the forementioned place, ſpeaketh of men and women of years: For you confeſs that infants as ſuch, cannot believe; and what then muſt follow if your cruel principles were true? Chriſt ſaith, *But he that believeth*

not, ſhall be damned: If this were as you would have it, ſpoken concerning infants alſo, what ſhould become of all thoſe that die in their infancy? what are they damn'd? Here appears an inexcuſable perverſneſs of theſe men, who when children are propoſed to their intereſt in general terms granted them, there they would exclude them, except they ſhew a particular warrant; and baptize all Nations, without a baptize infants, ſhall not advantage them for the ſeal of their admiſſion into Chriſts viſible Church: But where a general rule is mentioned, from whence they are in reaſon and all charitable conſtruction to be exempted, there it muſt include them for their diſadvantage, even to damnation, without any particular warrant for ſuch inteterpretation. Mr. *Cobbet* obſerveth well, That the Covenant-priviledges of grace, are ever to be expounded in favour of the principal or leſs principal counterparties, unleſs any exception be made of perſons or priviledges by him which was the Covenant-maker. To avoid this, you muſt either acknowledg that the place you cite, is either to be underſtood of thoſe of years who contumaciouſly reject the Ordinances of God, being hardned in wilfull blindneſs and unbelief, and ſo that it doth not concern children, as ſuch; or elſe you muſt allow infants ſome ſecret ſeeds of faith and regeneration, and ſo you ſhall juſtly acknowledg their capacity of baptiſm.

—Of child. baptiſmal right, cap. 8. concluſ. 7. pag. 143.

Plainly (you ſay) *thus, faith and baptiſm in conjunction, will bring a man to heaven; but if he have not faith, baptiſm ſhall do him no good.*]

Inviſibilem ſanctificationem quibuſdam affuiſſe & profuiſſe ſine viſibilibus ſacramentis: viſibilem vero

True in thoſe (who though baptized) as *Simon Magus*, are yet but in the gall of bitterneſs; but this is a meer *ignoratio elenchi*, hence to conclude againſt infants baptiſm; our queſtion not being whether all that are baptized ſhall be ſaved; but whether children of believing parents ought

ſanctificationem, quæ ſit ſacramento viſibili, ſine inviſibili, poſſe adeſſe, non poſſe prodeſſe: nec timen viſibile ſacramentum ideò contemnendum eſt, quia contemptor ejus inviſibiliter ſanctificari non poteſt, &c. P. Lombard. l. 4. diſt. 4. E. poſt Aug. ſup. Dev. in fine c. 8.

to be baptized; which if you would thus disprove, whosoever have not a saving faith that the Sacrament may do them good, may not be baptized; but children have not such faith, that baptism received may doe them good: *ergo*, children are not to be baptized: your reasoning would appear unreasonable, both Propositions being false or fallacious. The *Major*, because baptism is but the external seal of admission into the visible Church, into which elect and reprobates may enter, as it were into the *outward Court of the Temple*. And if saving faith finally doing the baptized good, or, which is the same, if the inward baptism by the holy Ghost, were the rule by which the baptizing Minister must proceed, what man were sufficient for that Office? The examples of *Simon Magus*, *Judas*, *Demas*, *&c.* shew enough that the most discerning men may be deceived in others fair profession; and who can foresee the final estates of men and women baptized? I cannot reasonably think that you take all those for elect, whom your selves baptize, or that your baptism shall doe them all good. And if you dispute κατὰ τὸ αὐτὸ, concerning one and the same faith in several degrees, that is, if you mean the seeds or habit of faith; that *Minor* is false; for elect infants have the seeds of faith in baptism, though they be not formed in them, yet by the secret working of the spirit, the seeds thereof for a time lying hidden in them, shall flourish and shew their growth in them in newness of life. If you mean it of actual faith, that want of that condition, ἐν τῷ αὐτῷ χρόνῳ, discovereth the *Paralogism*: And we say infants want of actual faith in present infancy thereof incapable, concludeth nothing against their having of it in mature age; and so as little against their baptism. I cannot conclude so well as in *Augustins* words; But (some may say) the things do some men no good; what must the Medicine therefore be neglected, because some mens pestilence is incurable?

Calvin. instit. l. 4. c. 15 N. 20.

At enim quibusdam ista non prosunt; nunquid ideo est negligenda medicina, quia nonnullorum est insanabilis pestilentia? Aug. ep. 48. Vincan.

So that if baptism be necessary, then so is faith, and much more; for want of faith damneth absolutely.]

I demand then, Do infants believe? Why do ye deny them baptiſm? or becauſe they have not faith, do you conclude them all damned who die in their infancy? That were a damnable aſſertion; and to pay you with your own coyn, *Againſt the perpetual analogie of Chriſts Doctrine*, who commanded infants to be brought unto him, bleſs them, and poſitively affirmed, that *Of ſuch is the Kingdom of heaven*, Further I ſay, If your Propoſition be univerſal, it is notoriouſly falſe; for all want of faith doth not abſolutely damn: For 1. They who pray for faith, or the increaſes thereof, (as the Diſciples did) want faith, yet were they not damned; he that hungereth and thirſteth for the righteouſneſs of faith, wanteth the ſame; for hunger and thirſt are of emptineſs: yet Chriſt pronounceth ſuch bleſſed. 2. He that now believeth not, may hereafter believe: It was *Pauls* caſe; had you ſeen him perſecute the faith and faithfull in *ignorance* and *unbelief*, would you preſently have devoted him to *abſolute damnation?* Judg not, that you be not judged: I know no man living that wanteth not faith; and I pray the good Lord to help my unbelief, and exhort you otherwiſe to expreſs your fancies, that they prove not ſnares to weak and afflicted conſciences.

Mat. 5. 6.

1 Tim. 1. 13.

Then (you ſay) *it is ſottiſh to ſay the ſame incapacity of reaſon and faith, ſhall not excuſe from the actual ſuſception of baptiſm, &c.*]

A very acute and witty aſſertion indeed; but we anſwer, 1. By this principle you might have been as blaſphemous againſt Gods Ordinance in circumciſion, had you lived under the Law. 2. We ſay not but that infants by their incapacity, are excuſed from actual ſuſception of baptiſm, for they cannot act thereto: But parents are not excuſable, if they contemn or neglect their parts in ſealing thoſe that are joynt heirs of the Promiſes and Covenant of God with them and their children; becauſe they have a capacity to promote and effect it: and this appeareth in the Hiſtory of *Moſes*, *Exod.* 4. 24,25. We very well know that

Quod in filiis Abrahæ per Circumciſionem, hoc in filiis Chriſtianorum per Baptiſmum manifeſtatum eſt, qui cum adhuc infirmiores à matre ferretur, præſenti & evidenti periculo ut circumcideretur exactum eſt, & cum facta eſt, depulſa eſt pernicies. Aug. contr. Donatiſt. l. 3. c. 24.

infants

infants cannot come and desire the Seals, their present incapacity excuseth them from that they cannot possibly do; but their parents or friends can intreat it for them, and present them to it: so that infants have a passive capacity; they cannot profess faith and repentance; but their parents professing of the same, interesseth them in all those external Church-priviledges whereof they are capable: and so to be born in the Church, is to them and for them, instead, and in place of their profession. What your terms of *reasonably* and *humanely received*, do mean, if to any purpose, want interpretation.

The conclusion (you say) *is, that baptism is also to be deferred till the time of faith.*]

Why might you not say the same also concerning circumcision? It is certain that by the same you may conclude, that many thousand persons of age must never be baptized, because they never come to believe; as for their profession, no man can say whether it be hypocritical or not.

Since faith is necessary to the susception of baptism, &c.] Pag. 240. Num. 29.

True *in adultis*; what is this to our present question concerning infants? We have often said that this your arguing *a dicto secundum quid ad dictum simpliciter*, is fallacious, and not passable among young Sophisters; and we owe no other answer then denying the consequence. Our contest is about Infant-baptism, wherein we say a present actual faith is not required: It is necessary, or at least the profession thereof in those who present to, or administer baptism; we cannot say so of infants, to whom God doth not yet give the use of reason: therefore they cannot first believe and after receive the Seal, as *Abraham* did: But therefore they are to be baptized that they may attain faith and salvation: So the word preached profiteth not, if it be not mixed with faith in them that hear; yet is the preaching thereof an effectual means whereby God will work faith in the hearers: To conclude, Baptism profiteth not without faith; yet is it an effectual means whereby God worketh regeneration and salvation, therefore none within

Ergo sunt baptizandi ut fidem & salutem consequantur. Jo. Gerard. de pœdobap. sect. 3. Numb. 196. Heb. 4. 2. Rom. 10. 17. Joh. 17. 20.

in his Covenant are to be barred from it. It is not improbably conjectured by ſome, that therefore the Diſciples forbad them to bring children to Chriſt, becauſe they thought children have not faith, nor can any teach them, who are yet incapable of doctrine: Poſſibly they did not yet underſtand the abolition of the old Seal for the introduction of the new, nor how baptiſm was to ſucceed circumciſion; that was ſometime after diſputed and determined, *Acts* 15. 1, 2. but Chriſt was much diſpleaſed with it, rebuked them, and ſeriouſly proteſted, that of ſuch is the kingdom of heaven.

Col. 2.

Pag. 241. *Whatever can be ſaid to take off from the neceſſity of actual faith all that, and much more* (you ſay) *may be ſaid to excuſe from the actual ſuſception of baptiſm.*]

True *in adultis*, but moſt falſe in infants; I am weary of telling you of your fallacious arguing, *à dicto ſecundum quid ad dictum ſimpliciter*: Again, if here by *actual ſuſception of baptiſm*, you mean that infants are to be excuſed from it, we have anſwered in the foregoing paragraph; if you mean from adminiſtration of infant baptiſm, we deny your aſſertion, and expect proof.

Parvulos baptizari in futuram pœnitentiam & fidem, quæ eſt in illis nondum formata ſunt, arcanâ tamen ſpiritus operatione utriuſque ſemen in illis latet. Inſt. l. 4. c. 16. n. 20. Sect. 15.

The ſecond device (you ſay) *was of* Calvin *and his.*]

You ſaid before that ſome ſaid infants have imputative faith, and by the number you now attribute it to *Calvin*; indeed Mr. *Calvin* ſaith, as I have noted, That infants are baptized into future repentance and faith, which although they be not yet formed in them, yet by the ſecret operation of the ſpirit, the ſeed of either lieth hid in them: and in the ſame chapter he ſaith as *Paul* there reaſoneth, That the *Jews* are ſanctified of their parents; ſo in another place he teacheth, That the children of Chriſtians receive the ſame ſanctification of their fathers: Alſo in the ſame chapter he ſaith — not that I mean raſhly to affirm, that they be indued with the ſame faith which we feel in our ſelves, or that they have at all knowledg of faith (which I had rather leave in ſuſpence, &c.) but concerning imputative faith, I find neither device nor approbation of *Calvins*. Why did you not rather ſay that this device was

1 Cor. 7. 14.

Sect. 19. -Nec tantum valet fides aliena parentis, quantum propria adulti, &c. P. Lombard. l. 4. diſt. 4. E.

P. Lom-

P. Lombards (who mentioneth the *Imputative faith* you ſpeak of) or ſome of the following Schoolmen? Or *Polydor Virgil* who in his fourth book concerning the Inventors of theſe things cleareth *Calvin* from this invention, ſaying —*Seeing infants, by reaſon of their age, cannot teſtifie their own faith,* as *Cyprian* ſaith, *it was provided from the beginning, that they ſhould profeſs their faith by others; that at anothers fault, to wit* Adam *our firſt parents ſin was evil to them, in ſo much that from their birth they were ſubject to originall ſin, ſo others endeavour might be good to them, who therefore* (*as* Ambroſe *ſaith in his ſecond book concerning the calling of the Gentiles*) *believe and are baptized by anothers confeſſion.* Or why do you not rather lay the invention hereof to *Juſtin Martyr*, who living long before any of theſe, ſaith, *They are made worthy of the good things of Baptiſm, by their faith who preſent them to be baptized?* The Reader may hence gather how little *Calvin* ſaid for *imputative faith*; and if he had affirmed any ſuch thing, yet how untrue it is, that *Calvin*, or any of his, invented it. But the pleader ſaith further,

Can an infant ſent into a Mahumetan Province, be more confident for Chriſtianity when he comes to be a man, then if he had not been baptized? Pag. 241.

Yes, *cæteris paribus*: for though the Sacraments work not the ſame effect in all receivers, yet Gods holy Spirit deſerteth not his ordinance in the elect, though for cauſes ever juſt, though moſt unknown to us, it doth not always alike ſhew its power in the recipient. It is true, that the ſeal and miniſtration of man can nothing profit where God giveth not the inward Baptiſm by his holy Spirit; though the inward may ſave without the outward, as hath been noted: but your ſuppoſition being rightly laid concerning an elect infant baptized, and ſo carried away, you muſt

— Requiritur *fides Eccleſiæ*, Al. Alent. de ſacr. bapt. q 8. m. 3. a. 1. ſect. 3. reſol. *Itemque* —— *parvulis in baptiſmo, merito — Chriſti, ſerentium fide, &c.* ib. m. 8. a. 3. ſect. 1. reſol.

—— *Fides aliena, ſine qua non datur parvulis remiſſio, non eſt fides offerentium, ſed eſt fides eccleſiæ.* Gab. Byel. in 4. lent. diſtinct 4 q. 2. G. ib. diſt. 6. q. 1. R: *Requiritur fides eccleſiæ, &c.* Polydore Virgil. de invent. l. 4. c. 4. inquir, *— Quibus cum per ætatem non liceret de ſuâ fide teſtari, à principio ſicut tradit* Cyprianus, *proviſum fuit, ut per alios credere profiterentur; quo quemadmodum alienâ culpâ, id eſt* Adam *primi parentis delictum eis quoq; malo fuit, quòd ſtatim nati originali peccato obligarentur, ſic aliena opera bono eſſet, qui idcirco, velut ait,* Ambroſius, l. de vocat. Gent. 2. *ex alienâ confeſſione credunt & baptizantur.* Ἀξιῶν τὸν ὑπὲρ διὰ τὸ βαπτίσμα καὶ ἀγαθῶν, τῇ πίστει τῶν προσφερόντων αὐτὸ τῷ βαπτίσματι. Juſt. Mart. q. & reſponſ. ad orthodox. q. 56.

grant, that God, whoſe election can by no means be defeated or made voyd, will give and make effectuall the means to the end, that is, ſalvation, whether by acquainting the party baptized with his will declared in his word preached to him, or by his ſecret work within him, if he will take him away in infancy: in the adult, coming to the knowledg of Gods covenant in Chriſt, and of his own ſealing in infancy, it muſt make him more confident of his implantation into Chriſt, then if he knew that he never had been baptized. What then? Muſt this be by vertue of baptiſm by water onely, or the externall miniſtration thereof? No, but by the power of Gods Spirit working on his ordinance, and accompliſhing his own decrees, do we follow your ſuppoſition, dividing preaching of the word to ſuch when they come to years, from the precedent ſeal? Truly ſuch a ſtrange invention were abſolutely without Art, without Scripture, reaſon or authority, I would ſay, as is your argument here alledged againſt infant-baptiſm, but that you call it *Demonſtrative* and *Unanſwerable*: but conſider how to overcome before you cry victory. To anſwer your ſuppoſition; ſuppoſe that an infant were not by any habituall faith ſo much as diſpoſed to any actuall belief without a new maſter; what could this conclude more then that it is neceſſary to the actuall faith of an infant come to fit years, that he be taught the doctrine of faith, repentance, &c. which we conſtantly affirm: what makes this againſt infant-baptiſm? We unanimouſly confeſs, and ſolemnly profeſs, that the infant, ſo ſoon as it ſhall be able to learn, ought to be, and ſhall be taught the myſteries of eternall life and ſalvation by Chriſt: ſo your demonſtration proves but a poor fallacie: you utterly miſtaking or willingly diſſembling the queſtion. We affirm not that the Word ought to be divided from the Sacrament whereof new-born infants are capable, but that the word is to be preached to them, & they are to be inſtructed in all the Rudiments of Chriſtian Religion, ſo ſoon as they ſhal be able to learn: I only add hereto, what have you ſaid in this your ſo much applauded argument againſt infant-

fant-baptiſm, which might not as reaſonably and religiouſly have been urged againſt infant-circumciſion? Could they if ſent into Painim-Countreys with all the terms of your ſuppoſition, have been more diſpoſed to an actual belief without a new Maſter? yet they had, and we have right to the ſeal of the righteouſneſſe of Faith, not for any excellency or ability to produce any good and ſaving effect in our ſelves, but through the merits of our Saviour, the free mercy of God, and the right of our Fathers, with whom God made his Covenant for their perſons and poſterity. Next, you ſay,

To which alſo this conſideration may be added, That if baptiſm be neceſſary to the ſalvation of infants, upon whom is the impoſition laid?] Pag. 241: Numb. 30.

Concerning Baptiſm in generall, 'tis conſiderable which *Tertullian* ſaith, *The Lord himſelf who owed no repentance, was baptized; and was it not neceſſary to ſinners?* his reaſon will reach (poſſibly beyond his opinion) to infants alſo, except we ſhould ſay with *Pelagius*, that they are not ſinners. Further we ſay, that Baptiſm, the laver of regeneration, is neceſſary to the ſalvation of infants; yet in caſe of privation or impoſſibility, they are ſaved by the peculiar and extraordinary goodneſs and providence of God. So that the neceſſity of Baptiſm, as hath been avowed, is not abſolute, as if none could be ſaved without it; but neceſſary on our part, who are to obey the ordinance of God. God is not tied to his ordinance, but we are: he can otherwiſe ſave, but we cannot be ſaved in the contempt thereof. *God* (ſaith *Tertullian*) hath bound faith to the neceſſity of Baptiſm; therefore *Cornelius* and thoſe that were with him, after they were ſanctified by the holy Ghoſt, were yet baptized; neither is the viſible ſanctification ſuper-

Diſtinguimus igitur inter neceſſitatem ex parte Dei, & ex parte noſtri: inter caſum privationis & viam ordinariam, &c. Ioh. Gerhard. de Baptiſm. c. 7. c. 237.

Obſtrinxit fidem ad baptiſmi neceſſitatem. Tertul. q. 1. c. 13.

—— *Nec tamen viſibile Sacramentum ideo contemnendum; quia contempto ejus inviſibiliter ſanctificari non poteſt. Hinc* Cornelius, *& qui cum eo erant, jam Spiritu ſanctificati, baptizati ſunt: nec ſuperflua judicanda eſt, &c.* P. Lomb. ſent. l. 4. diſt. 4. E.

fluous, becauſe the inviſible preceded; ſeeing God alone giveth the one, and appointeth man to do the other for a ſeal and confirmation of his covenant. You ſay more,

To whom is the commandement given? To the Parents or to the children? Not to the children, for they are not capable of a law; not to the parents, for then God hath put the ſalvation of innocent babes into the power of others, and infants may be damned for their fathers careleſneſs or malice, &c.]

You trifle here; you know that we hold no ſuch neceſſity of the means, as hath been ſaid; your foundation therefore failing, nothing of your ſuperſtructure can ſtand. If men neglect or contemn the ordinance of God toward their infants ſalvation, they do as much as in them lieth, to ſhut them from heaven: but yet *the foundation of the Lord remaineth ſure, having this ſeal, the Lord knoweth them that are his* though men neglect to mark them, who cannot help themſelves thereto, yet the Lord knoweth all his, and is not unjuſt to puniſh the childs involuntary defect for the parents voluntary neglect, which God will ſeverely puniſh, though the child ſhall be held guiltleſs thereof, as may appear in the fore-recited example of *Moſes*; which might perſwade conſidering men to beware of denying children baptiſm (for if the neglect be ſuch a ſin, what is the contempt therof?) to which their parents faith giveth them right; not as an efficient, principall, or meritorious cauſe of infants ſalvation, but as a ſign and ſeal of Gods good will towards their children, whoſe providence cauſing them to be born of ſuch parents ſheweth that he vouchſafeth them the priviledge of his covenant: and how horrible a preſumption is it for man to take away that which God pleaſeth to give?

2 Tim. 2. 19.

See *Mr. Cobbet* of child. Baptiſm. right, ſect 10. p. 447, 448.

... qui dum eis ex talibus parentibus naſci fecit, oſtendit, quid cum fœdere ſuo dignatus Andr. Rivet to. 2. tract. 3. q. 3. n. 2.

It follows (ſay you) *that it is not neceſſary at all to be done to them to whom it cannot be preſcribed as a law, and in whoſe behalfe it cannot be reaſonably intruſted to others with the appendant neceſſity.*]

We have ſaid enough concerning the neceſſity you ſtil harp on, and fear to weary the Reader by telling you, we hold

hold no ſuch abſolute neceſſity as we have expreſſed; but that it follows not that it is neceſſary at all to be done, &c. is evidently falſe, as may appear in circumciſion, which was enjoyned the parents, not the children; as untrue is your ſecond branch (*in whoſe behalf it cannot be reaſonably entruſted to others* —) for the infants circumciſion was reaſonably entruſted to the parent under this neceſſity — *The uncircumciſed man-child* — *that perſon ſhall be cut off from his people*, *Gen.* 17.14.

And (you ſay) *if it be not neceſſary, it is certain it is not reaſonable.*]

Stay and prove that it is not neceſſary, before you build up many concluſions upon that which never was, nor will be granted you. We have ſhewed how 'tis neceſſary.

It is nowhere in terms preſcribed.]

Neither is the Sabbath which we obſerve, nor many other things which of duty we do perform: See what hath been anſwered hereto, *pag.* 240. *Num.* 28. and ſo we baptize infants; for it is both reaſonable, and they have a capacity thereof, though you deny both.

Either baptiſm produceth ſpiritual effects, or it produceth them not, &c.] Pag. 242. Num. 31.

A rare *Dilemma*, but that 'tis fallacious. Reduce it to a Syllogiſm, and it will appear a *Paralogiſm ex accidente*. Suppoſe thus,

That which produceth no ſpiritual effects, is not to be contended for; but baptiſm produceth no ſpiritual effect; *ergo*, it is not to be contended for: Who knows not that 'tis accidental to baptiſm to produce no ſpiritual effect in the baptized? This is for mans unbelief and forſaking the Covenant, by wilfull ſinning which doth *ponere obicem*, and make the Ordinance of none effect to ſalvation: If we ſhould thus diſpute, That which cauſeth wrath is evil; but the Law cauſeth wrath, *ergo*, the Law is evil: the Fallacy were the ſame: For it is accidental, and through mans diſobedience that the Law cauſeth wrath; of it ſelf it is good and holy, right and pure: ſo here, though baptiſm produce no good ſpiritual effect in the reprobate (or not Rom. 4 15. Rom. 7. 12. Pſal. 19. 7, 8.

ſ.v

ex opere operato) yet by the inſtitution of God, whoſe ſpirit worketh on his Ordinance, it doth.

What are we nearer heaven if we are baptized?]

If I were of your Councel, I would entreat you to beware of theſe political temporizings which come ſo near Atheiſm: Believe you the Scriptures who thus ſlight Gods holy Ordinances?

But if—— baptiſm does do a work upon the ſoul, producing ſpiritual benefits and advantages, theſe advantages are produced by the external work of the Sacrament alone, or by that as it is helped by the co-operation and prediſpoſitions of the ſuſcipient.

Here you bring another fallacy, *à non causâ pro causâ*. We ſay that neither are the effects or ſpiritual advantages of baptiſm, produced by the external work of the Sacrament alone, nor by that as it is helped by the co-operation and pre-diſpoſition of the ſuſcipient (as hath been proved) but by the ſpirit of God working on his own Ordinance.

If (you ſay) *by the external work alone, how doth this differ from the* opus operatum *of Papiſts, ſave that it is worſe?*

If the Skie fall we ſhall have Larks. Who affirms that which you ſuppoſe?

For they ſay the Sacrament does not produce it's effect but in a ſuſcipient diſpoſed by all requiſites and due preparations of piety, faith and repentance.]

Do they ſay ſo when they ſpeak of infant-baptiſm? ſlander them not; herein they are better then you who deny infants baptiſm, which they grant though children cannot actually believe, confeſs, profeſs or repent.

But this opinion ſaies it does of it ſelf, without the help or ſo much as the coexiſtence of any condition but the meer reception.]

Make much of the *Minerva* of your own brain; if it be your opinion, we own it not.

But if the Sacrament does not do its work alone, but per modum recipientis, *according to the prediſpoſitions of the ſuſcipient,*

ſuſcipient, then becauſe infants can neither hinder it, nor do any thing to further it, it does them no benefit at all.]

You might have pleaded the ſame againſt circumciſion, with as good ſucceſs: They could neither hinder it, nor do any thing to further it; did it therefore do them no benefit at all? But who ſaith it is *per modum recipientis*, &c. which is not properly expreſſed according to the *prediſpoſition*, *Per modum* ſpeaks a cauſe, *ad*, or *ſecundum*, a condition: We ſay that the Sacrament doth work according to the diſpoſitions of the receivers, becauſe God gives that to infants which makes them fit to be baptized, giving them by his own Covenant with his believieving parents, federal holyneſs, and ſo a right to the external initiatory ſeal of his Covenant with them: Whether it do them good or no, whether it produce a ſpiritual good effect or no (that is to regeneration and ſalvation) a right they have to the external ſeal, as being born within the Church, and that as ſoon as they are born; we underſtand not any other *prediſpoſing* cauſe in the infant to be baptized, as if he were able to contribute any thing to his receptibility, more then the unborn *Jacob* was in relation to the love of God, which indeed never found any cauſe but it ſelf; yet ere the children were born, God loved *Jacob* and hated *Eſau*. Rom.9.11, &c. 2 Cor.5.10. Rom.3.20. Further we ſay, as we ſhall be ſaved *ſecundum opera*, but not *propter opera*: Good works are in the regenerate excellent ſignes of juſtification and ſalvation future, they cannot be the cauſes of either; they follow, they cannot precede juſtification: So we may ſay that baptiſm works according to the diſpoſitions of the ſuſcipient, which are not in infants, faith, profeſſion, repentance, *&c.* which God gives not to infants, but to perſons of years; but as to their right to baptiſm by his Couenant: what other prediſpoſitions are in them are ſecret, and known to God above. And ſo your *exploded fancy* and dream of a notable advantage vaniſheth.

Either baptiſm (you ſay) *is a meer Ceremony, or it implies a duty on our part. If it be a ceremony only, how doth it ſanctifie us, or make the comers thereunto perfect? If*

it.

it implys a duty on our part, how then can children receive it, who cannot do duty at all?]

How many impertinences are here twiſted up together? We anſwer plainly, Ceremony and duty on mans part, are not *membra dividentia*, nor always contradiſtinct; for they may *coïncidere*; as in thoſe ceremonies of the Law, which being commanded of God, were duties of men ſubject to the Law, and to be performed, though they could not *make the comers thereunto perfect*: and ſo is baptiſm now a duty on our part to be adminiſtred, though of it ſelf it cannot make all the comers thereunto perfect. But you demand, if it implies *a duty on our part, how then can children receive it, who cannot do duty at all*? Where is now the *revelation, reaſon, common ſenſe, and all experience in the world*, in which you ſo lately triumphed, as if you had driven us to take ſanctuary? If it be a duty on our part to adminiſter it, how can children receive it, *who cannot do any duty at all*? Nay but tell me, if you can, by all your reaſon, how could infants receive baptiſm except we did adminiſter it? ſay you, how can he be paſſive who cannot be active at all? how could infants receive circumciſion, who could do as little duty as infants now can? That *homonymical* (on our part) muſt be otherwiſe limited by ſome expreſſion, or elſe your Argument will appear fallacious. It is a duty on our part to baptize infants; on the childrens part no duty is required; they can do none, as ſuch; for God enjoyneth no impoſſibilities. But you ſay,

—This way of miniſtration, makes baptiſm to be wholly an outward duty, a work of the Law, a carnal Ordinance, it makes us adhere to the letter, without any regard of the ſpirit, &c.]

This *Rhetorick* would ſomthing better becom him that careth not what, but how much he ſaith. All theſe vain and injurious expreſſions, are meer aſperſions: and call you this an Argument conſiderable? wherein appears either matter or form thereto pertinent? For the reſt (which in ſome other man I ſhould take for ſome *ægri inſomnium*) we ſay if you mean by *Myſtery*, the ſpiritual baptiſm myſteriouſly

ſteriouſly ſignified by the outward miniſtration, to which you ſeem to drive; 'tis evident that it doth not alwaies accompany it (except you will ſay that the Sacrament juſtifieth *ex opere operato*, which a little before you would have pinned on our backs) which appears in *Judas*, *Simon Magus*, and all others who fall away: And as certainly falſe is it, that *it never follows in order of time*; common experience ſhewing that the ſpiritual ſeed ſowed in baptiſm, many times, and in many of the baptized, lieth long before it actually appeareth, either in any outward effects, inward ſignes of calling, or fruits of regeneration; as in *Abraham* faith preceded, and circumciſion the ſeal of the righteouſneſs of faith, followed: ſo in *Cornelius*, a ſpiritual ſanctification preceded, and baptiſm followed; but in *Iſaak* circumciſed the eight day, the ſeal preceded, and faith and ſanctity followed: So in Infant-baptiſm the ſeal and laver of regeneration goeth before, and actual faith followeth it in ſeaſon, if they hold faſt the faith of Chriſt. You ſay again,

Pag. 242. Pag. 243.

Auguſtin. contr. Donat. l. 4. c. 21.

Baptiſm is never propounded, mentioned or enjoyned as a means of remiſſion of ſins, or of eternal life, but ſomething of duty, choice, and ſanctity is joyned with it, in order to production of the end ſo mentioned. Know you not that as many as are baptized into Chriſt Jeſus, are baptized into his death, &c.] Rom. 6. 3.

Good reaſon that ſuch things ſhould be propounded, mentioned and enjoyned to thoſe who converting to the faith in years capable of Doctrine, require the ſeal of Gods Covenant; and certainly ſo was it to Proſelytes to be circumciſed; but you cannot reaſonably think, that they propoſed or enjoyned Infants to be circumciſed any ſuch things: and it were as vain to propoſe any of theſe to Infants now to be baptized: Therefore we ſeal them now, and propound theſe like things to them when they be capable: Now the Scripture ſpeaking to men or women of underſtanding, propounds to them their preſent duty who are to be baptized, or who are baptized, as faith, repentance, walking in newneſs of life, mortification; and (as hath

been ſaid) the Apoſtles in the *eccleſiâ conſtituendâ* had moſtly to do, being to endeavour the calling and converſion of the Gentiles, who before were aliens from the Covenant of God: But in *eccleſiâ conſtitutâ*, we rarely meet with any firſt to be taught, and then to be ſealed; the children of Chriſtian parents having Church-priviledg, are now baptized firſt (as in the ſetled Covenant under the Law they were firſt circumciſed) and when they come to fit years, inſtructed: And what then do all your impertinences diſadvantage our cauſe, ſeeing elect infants in their baptiſm, are implanted into Chriſt, and in due time walk in newneſs of life?

This is indeed truly to be baptized, both in the Symbole and the Myſtery: Whatſoever is leſs then this, is but the Symbole, only a meer ceremony, &c.]

The effects of elect childrens baptiſm being nothing leſs, this *Rhetorick* might have been ſpared.

Plainer yet; Whoſoever are baptized into Chriſt, have put on Chriſt, have put on the new man: But to put on this new man, is to be formed in righteouſneſs, and holyneſs, and truth, &c.]

All this plainly makes for infants baptiſm, who being naturally fleſh and blood, ſuch as cannot enter into the Kingdom of heaven, conceived and born in ſin, children of wrath, muſt indeed put on Chriſt Jeſus that they may be ſaved: Theſe premiſes we willingly adhere to; but your concluſion is liable to a *non ſequitur*; becauſe it is either fallacious, diſputing *ab adultis ad infantes*, which wanting the condition πρὸς τὸ λυτὸ, becomes an *ignoratio elenchi*, and miſtaking or miſpurſuing the Queſtion, or begging it in thoſe terms (*remaining in the preſent incapacities*) which cannot be granted. I anſwer two things, 1. God can give capacity of regeneration, and newneſs of life to any age; That he doth not give it to infants, cannot appear to us: The contrary doth; for he giveth the ſpirit of ſanctification to ſome infants, in, and from the womb; for many dying young, are ſaved, which being conceived in ſin, and born the children of wrath, they could not be, without re-

gene-

generation and ſanctification: And truly when I conſider what marvelous inſtinct God giveth to the new-caſt young of beaſts, to take the breſt (as well as to new-born infants) for their bodily preſervation, I cannot but conceive that the good God gives infants (on whom he hath ſet his own image, which conſiſteth in underſtanding, ſanctity, immortality, &c.) ſome admirable, though to us ſecret, light of mind, and capacity of that which is ſubordinate to the preſervation of their immortal ſouls. 2. Children under the Goſpel have no leſs capacity then children under the Law had, who yet received the ſeal of the ſame righteouſneſs of faith in their infancy, and were circumciſed to newneſs of life. *Rom.* 4.29. But you ſay,

Quæ conſiſtit in immortalitate, innocentiâ, & juſtitiâ, reliquaque animi dotibus. Vatabl. in Gen. 1 26. See Mr Cobbet. Explicat. of Mat 28. & Mar. 16. pag. 177. pag. 244. 1 Pet. 3.21.

— *And then have they but one member of the diſtinction uſed by S* Peter, *they have that baptiſm which is a putting away the filth of the fleſh; but they have not that baptiſm which is the anſwer of a good conſcience towards God, which is the only baptiſm that ſaveth us* —]

I anſwer, 1. You vainly diſpute *è non conceſſis*; 'tis not granted, nor can it ever be proved that elect children in baptiſm are not *formed new in righteouſneſs and holyneſs*; and ſo your ſuperſtruction concerning their having only that baptiſm which is *a putting away the filth of the fleſh*, but not the reſt neceſſary to ſalvation, is frivolous. 2. *The anſwer of a good conſcience toward God*, is an effect of the inward baptiſm by the ſpirit of Jeſus, peculiar to the elect. Now if your reaſon hence taken, for the excluſion of infants from baptiſm, the external ſeal, were good; by the ſame reaſon none but the elect, or thoſe who have the *anſwer of a good conſcience towards God*, muſt be admitted to baptiſm. and whom then might you with good conſcience baptize? certainly but few; and for ought you can certainly know, none: For in theſe laſt and worſt dayes, what know you, but that they who fairly profeſs faith and repentance, &c. may yet notwithſtanding be meer hypocrites? And where is then their *anſwer of a good conſcience toward God*? 3. I ſay, what ſecret light, and ſweet confidence elect infants have in God, I know not; ſure I am they have that which is and ſhall be ſufficient to their ſalvation in

Chriſt, though they die before man can teach them more: and why ſhall man exclude them from the external Seal of Gods Covenant with them (as being born within the Church) of which they have as evident (and a more eaſie) capacity then children had of circumciſion? God] gives Infants the incomparably greater and more excellent part, ſanctity and ſealing to ſalvation; and ſhall man preſume to deny the leſs and ſubordinate part, the external Seal of Chriſts viſible Church, whereof Reprobates, born within the Church, have a capacity? 4. Faith, good conſcience, repentance, *&c.* are in the elect thoſe fruits, whoſe ſeeds were ſowen in baptiſm; and (as hath been ſaid) were it reaſonable to ſay, we may not ſow untill the fruits thereof appear? Nay, but we therefore ſow in hope, that we may in due ſeaſon ſee and reap the fruits thereof. 5. Whereas you ſay that the anſwer of a good conſcience towards God, is the *only baptiſm that ſaveth us*; I anſwer, 1. It is not the anſwer of a good conſcience that ſaveth any man, though a good conſcience be an excellent ſigne of our ſalvation by Chriſt; for, *Being juſtified by faith, we have peace with God through our Lord Jeſus Chriſt, by whom alſo we have acceſs by faith*, &c. 2. Your reaſoning is fallacious, your medium being *homonymical:* For, allowing you the ſigne for the cauſe, yet if that (*which ſaveth us*) though it may be true, if underſtood concerning perſons of years, and as good conſcience, an undoubted effect of regeneration, is oppoſed to the bare ſeal thereof, without any inward effect of the ſpirit. I ſay if it be underſtood of Infants, as in your ſenſe, excluded from a capacity of good conſcience, or the acts thereof, it is very falſe, except you will alſo exclude *all Infants* from ſalvation, which were againſt the expreſs doctrine of Chriſt.

Rom. 5. 1, 2.

As infants (you ſay) *by the force of nature cannot put themſelves into a ſupernatural condition* (*and therefore ſay the Pœdobaptiſts, they need baptiſm to put them into it*) *ſo if they be baptized before the uſe of reaſon, before the works of the ſpirit, before the operation of grace, before they can throw off the works of darkneſs, and live in righteouſneſs & newneſs of life, they are never the near.*]

I

I anſwer, 1. Neither can men of years *by the force of nature put themſelves into a ſupernatural condition*, ſuppoſing you mean ſubordinate to ſalvation; and what then can the uſe of reaſon without the works of the Spirit, advantage them hereto? Shall not they therefore that have the uſe of reaſon be baptized? 2. What do you herein ſay which might not as well have been objected againſt the circumciſion of infants? Would you have concluded them never the neer, becauſe at eight dayes old they had not the uſe of reaſon to know what or why it was ſo done uuto them before they could throw off the works of darkneſs, and live in righteouſneſs and newneſs of life? 3. If you will have none baptized *before the works of the Spirit, before the operations of grace, &c.* when and whom may you baptize? For *the Wind bloweth where it liſteth, and thou heareſt the ſound thereof, but canſt not tell whence it cometh and whither it goeth: ſo is every one that is born of the Spirit.* God can, and doth ſanctifie infants (as in the elect infants, dying ſuch muſt be granted, if you have ſo much reaſon or charity as to think that at leaſt ſome of them are elected and ſaved) and he can and doth ſanctifie in age, ſometimes in the very laſt act thereof, as appeared in the penitent thief; how then will it follow that infants are never the neerer if they be baptized before the uſe of reaſon, &c. 4. We muſt underſtand that baptiſm comprehendeth firſt, the ſign water, and the whole ceremony, ſprinkling, waſhing, or dipping into water in the Name of the Father, the Son, and the holy Ghoſt. Secondly, the things themſelves ſignified by the viſible and externall things, which are ſprinkling of the blood of *Jeſus* on the baptized for the remiſſion of ſins, mortification of the old man, quickning the new man into certain hope of reſurrection to eternall life to come. Thirdly, the commandement & promiſe of *Chriſt*, whence the ſign hath authority and power of ſealing and confirming theſe things unto the baptized. They then that ſay baptiſm is an externall ſign and waſhing of the body, and therefore a bare and effectleſs ſign, do fallaciouſly diſpute, dividing that which God

John 3. 8.

Fallacia diviſionis.

God (who cannot deceive us) hath joyned together, by giving us order to baptize, and be baptized for the remiſſion of ſins freely for *Chriſts ſake*, into whom we are implanted by Baptiſm. How falſe then muſt it be which you, upon the matter, affirm that we ſhall be never the neerer, if we cannot contribute ſomthing to the efficacie of Baptiſm in the uſe of our own reaſon? Certainly Gods Spirit accompanieth his ordinance in the elect, ſooner or later: If the reprobate be never the nearer ſalvation for his baptiſm, that is accidentall, & maketh nothing againſt the effectuall ſealing of the elect to eternall life in their baptiſm. There are many ſorts of hearers of the Word; ſome like the ſtony ground, ſome like the thorny, ſome like the high-way; ſhall the Apoſtaſie, unbelief, and barrennes of the greater part, make the ordinance of God of none effect to believers? To conclude, it is but the outward miniſtration which is committed to us; the capacity or incapacity, fruitbearing or ſterility of receivers, belongs to God to judge of, not to us; we muſt do our duty, and leave the iſſues to to him. But you ſay,

Matth. 13.

From the pains of hell they ſhall be ſaved by the mercies of God and their own innocency, though they die in puris naturalibus, *and baptiſm will carry them no further.*]

What? Popery and Pelagianiſm twiſted together? If you ſpeak of childrens ſalvation by the mercies of God to his elect, ſo far we accord: if you ſay by their own innocency, that *Pelagians* and *Donatiſts* taught, who affirmed that infants were born without originall ſin, and therefore would not have them baptized. Againſt this hereſie the ſecond *Milvetian* Councel determined *Canon* 2. as hath been noted. For that you ſay they ſhall be ſaved though they die in *puris naturalibus*, that is, ſuch as they are by nature without regeneration, it is againſt the expreſs word of God, as may clearly appear, in that all are conceived and born in ſin, the children of wrath by nature: *That which is born of the fleſh is fleſh, — and fleſh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God*, that is, ſuch as it is by, and in the ſtate of corrupted nature; therefore except the infant

*** *Quicunque parvulos recentes ab uteris matrum baptizandos negat aut dicit, in remiſſionē peccatorum eos baptizari, ſed nihil ex Adam trahere originalis peccati, quod regenerationis lavacro expietur, &c, Anathema ſit.* Concil Milvetian. 2. can. & ibi eod. Can. Eccleſ. Afric. 110. Aug. l. 3. *de peccatorum merit.* Hieron. tom. 2. adverſ. Pelag. l. 3. Pſal. 51. 5. Eph. 2 3. John 3. 6. 1 Cor. 15. 50. John 3. 5.

fant be regenerate, he cannot enter into the kingdome of God. That which you ſay, *that Baptiſm will carry infants no further*, then from the pains of hell, ſmels ſtrongly of Popery: They ſay that children dying without Baptiſm, ſhall have *pœnam damni, non ſenſus*, that is, they ſhall be free from hell fire, but that they ſhall not enter into heavenly joys: But *Auguſtine* ſo far ſaid well, there is not to any, any middle place, that he can be any where but with the Divel, who is not with *Chriſt*. Certainly the Scripture mentioneth onely heaven for the elect and bleſſed, and hell for the reprobate and damned.

Vid. Bellar. to. 4. de amiſſ. gratiæ. l. 6. c. 2, 3, 4. *Non eſt ullius ulli medius locus ut poſſit eſſe niſi cum diabolo, qui non eſt cum Chriſto.* de peccat. merit. c. 28. & ib. ſerm. 14. de verb. Apoſtoli.

For that Baptiſm that ſaveth us is not onely the waſhing with water, of which onely children are capable, but the anſwer of a good conſcience towards God, of which they are not capable till the uſe of reaſon, till they know to chuſe the good and refuſe the evill.]

If you mean *by waſhing with water*, baptiſm according to *Chriſts inſtitution* adminiſtred; we ſay alſo it is *not that onely* (which is the Miniſters part to give) *which ſaveth us*, but the power and grace of Gods Spirit inwardly baptizing, ſanctifying, regenerating and cleanſing us from our ſins by the pretious blood of *Jeſus* that ſaveth us: Now that infants are not hereof capable till the uſe of reaſon, is evidently falſe, if you but hold theſe three Principles; 1. That no unregenerate unclean perſon can be ſaved, 2. That all mankind is born in ſin, *Rom.* 5. 12. 3. That ſome infants dying before their uſe of reaſon, are ſaved. That which you ſay, that infants are capable of waſhing with water (that is of baptiſm, or elſe you trifle) we aſſent to, and deſire you to ſay no more; infants of believing parents, that is of profeſſed *Chriſtians*, are capable of baptiſm: for the reſt we contend not, we refer the effect thereof in particulars to God, who alone knoweth his elect, and how and when to give them the inward fruit of his own ordinances: we neither affirm that all the baptized ſhall be ſaved, neither can we or you determine which ſhall, and which ſhall not, but indifferently, as charity requireth, hope well of every one whom we baptize, concerning

cerning whom we can ſay nothing to the contrary. But you ſay,

All vows made by perſons under other names, ſtipulations made by minors, are not valid till they (be) by a ſupervening act after they are of a ſufficient age to raeiſie them.]

To which we anſwer, 1. though all be not valid in ſuch caſe, it is enough that ſome are: 2. Your aſſertion, if granted, that is, that all vows or (which is more then you affirm) if no vows made by perſons under others names, or *ſtipulations made by minors*, or perſons in their minority, are not valid untill by a ſupervening act after they are of ſufficient age to ratifie them they are confirmed: what could this make againſt our duty of Infant-baptiſm? the caſe being much different between ſtipulations of men, and the covenant between God & man, as hath been ſhewed, & as appeared in circumciſion which was with Infants eight days old.

In Gen. 17. p. p. 99, &c. Mr. *Cobbet* well obſerveth, that the covenant of grace is as well a teſtament, 1 *Cor.* 11.25. *Heb.* 9.15, *&c.* Now a teſtament may be, and uſeth to be made in reference to little ones without knowledge: nor do any uſe to deny a childs right in the Teſtators will, — becauſe it underſtood not the ſame: and that many Infants with whom God made the covenant, *Gen.* 17. dying ſuch, were yet ſaved: and that they reſtipulate in their Parents knowing acceptance of the covenant, and profeſſed owning of it upon the Covenant terms, as wel on their childrens parts as their own: & they reſtipulate in a paſſive reception of the Covenant condition & bond to after imitation of their father *Abrahams* faith & obedience. Again, our queſtion is not concerning the ratification or effect of Infant-baptiſm, by their act or acts, to make it good to themſelves and effectuall, when they come of age; but concerning a Church-priviledge on Infants part, which is to be admitted unto the externall ſeal of Gods Covenant with his Church, it being to Parents and their children; and this dependth on Gods inſtitution to appoint it, and his inward working to make it good: Secondly, in the confirmation of children come to age, they then profeſſing faith, obedience, repentance, newneſs of life,

life, &c. into which in their infancy they were baptized, that is, then ratified which others promiſed and ſtipulated for them, as concerning outward profeſſion, which is in your language a *ſupervening act*, to make the former appear valid. Thirdly, the queſtion is not concerning the final effect of baptiſm in particulars baptized, which cannot fall under the Miniſters cognizance (it being kept in heaven in the *archives* and ſecret counſel of God) but concerning their right to baptiſm, who are born within the verge and precincts of the Church. Whether ſuch infants doe afterwards believe, repent, and amend their lives to ſalvation by Chriſt, or not, we cannot foreſee, nor have we any exception to ſuperſede or limit our duty of adminiſtring the outward ſeal of baptiſm: For as much as children born of Chriſtian parents and within the Church, are thereby partakers of the Covenant of grace, even they who are not partakers of the grace of the Covenant. Fourthly, we anſwer, That children in Gods account, do vow, confeſs, and avouch the Lord in their parents vowing, confeſſion, or avouching him, as they did of old; which the learned Mr. *Cobbet* obſerveth from *Deut.* 26. 17, 18. where we read—*Thou haſt avouched the Lord this day, to be thy God, and to walk in his waies*, &c. *and the Lord hath avouched thee this day, to be his peculiar people, as he hath promiſed thee*——and *Deut*, 19. 10, 11, &c. *Ye ſtand this day all of you before the Lord your God: Your Captains and your Tribes, your Elders and your Officers, with all the men of* Iſrael, *your little ones, your wives and ſtrangers*—— *that thou ſhouldeſt enter into a Covenant with the Lord thy God, and into his Oath which the Lord thy God maketh with thee this day, that he may eſtabliſh thee to day for a people unto himſelf, and that he may be unto thee a God, as he hath ſaid unto thee, and as he hath ſworn unto thy fathers, to* Abraham, to Iſaak, *and to* Jacob, *&c.* whereof ſee *Gen.* 19. 7. Though therefore ſome ſtipulations made in minority and nonage, bind not the perſon under age, except he confirm it when he com-

1 Pet. 1. 4.

Pag. 121.

eth to age, yet you will not ſay that the ſame is not valid if made by Parents, Governors, or Guardians for children: and ſo in ſome publick Covenants and Acts of one City or State, with another, which concern the preſent and future ages, the infants within that City or State, as being in minority free Deniſons, are bound by the ſame Covenant and Act, though as ſuch, they could neither tranſact, ſpeak, nor conſent to the ſame, but all was agreed on and done by their Parents or Commiſſioners of years thereto deſigned, in their own and childrens name: which may apear in *Iſraels* Covenant with the Gibeonites, which, though the ſtipulators were beguiled, yet *Iſraels* children were bound to, and when *Saul* out of a perverſe zeal, about 380 * years after, would needs violate, how binding that Covenant was, God declared in a ſevere judgment on *Sauls* Family, and all *Iſrael*. But upon this invalid ſuppoſition you build another quere.

Joſh. 9. 15.

* Rather 433.

2 Sam. 21. 1.

——— *Why were it not as good they ſtayed to make it, till that time, before which time if they do make it, it is to no purpoſe? this would be conſidered.*]

It would, or ſhould be conſidered, that it is very dangerous playing thus with the ſacred Ordinances of God: You confeſs that baptiſm is the only inlet into the Church of Chriſt; and is it to no purpoſe to be let into his Church and Covenant, out of which you ſay there is no ſalvation? 'Tis true that all are not ſaved that are within the Church and Covenant, but no man is ſaved out of it. God hath appointed baptiſm to be a ſeal and token of our receiving and entrance into the Church; is it to no purpoſe to obey him in his Ordinances? God would not only have all the Citizens of his Church thus enfranchiſed, but thoſe who are not baptized when they may, he will not have reckoned in the number of his Church: And ſay you, 'tis to no purpoſe to have children marked for members of Chriſts Church? Baptiſm is Gods mark whereby he will have his people diſcerned from all other falſe Churches and Sects; and think you 'tis to no purpoſe to have Gods mark ſet on children, that they may not with

Urſin part. 2. Chriſt. relig.

a

a periſhing world be toucht by the deſtroyers? Yet you ſay,

Our way is the ſurer way; for not to baptize children till they can give an account of their faith, is the moſt proportionable to an Act of Reaſon and humanity, and it can have no danger in it.] Pag. 244. Num. 2.

How often hath Satan in tempting to ſin, miſled the incaucious with this ſuggeſtion, there can be no danger in it, 'tis the ſurer way? 'tis neither *reaſonable* nor *humane* wilfully to act his part, and as much as in us lieth, to ſhut infants from the kingdom of heaven; and ſo to doe that which much angred Chriſt in the daies of his fleſh; to wit, to barr or forbid children to come to him; this *would be conſidered.* And why is it more proportionable to *an act of reaſon and humanity* to defer childrens baptiſm, then in due time to baptize them? Infants were circumciſed long before they could give any account of their faith, and yet that act was proportionable to reaſon; and *Moſes* was near a ſad affliction for delaying it. You ſay further, Mark 10. Exod. 4.

For to ſay that infants may be damned for want of baptiſm, &c. pag. 245.

I know no Proteſtant that ever ſaid ſo: but take heed you damn not your ſelves by teaching contempt of the Sacrament: We are well ſatisfied that the privation thereof ſhall not condemn infants, it not being their fault if they want it; it may be, and certainly is theirs, who teach men to deny it them: And then conſider in the inviolable juſtice of God, whoſe the damnation will be. We cannot conceive that a meer privation of circumciſion condemned thoſe *Hebrew* babes who died before the eighth day; becauſe God is unchangeably juſt, who confined their ſealing to that day; yet you will grant that it was a great ſin (except in caſe of evident and inevitable neceſſity, as during *Iſraels* marches in the Wilderneſs) a great ſin I ſay of parents to neglect the adminiſtration thereof (for God never threatned any puniſhment, ſuch as is mentioned, *Gen.* 17. 14. but in reſpect of great ſin) much more was it obſtinately to deny it them: It is certainly true

Contemptus ſacramenti damnat, non privatio. Bern, ep. 37. *Voluntas pro facto inputatur ubi factum excludit neceſſitas.* ib. ep. 77.

which hath been noted out of *Auguſtine*. There may be converſion of the heart without baptiſm; but it cannot be in the contempt of baptiſm; for it can by no means be called the converſion of the heart to God, when the Sacrament of God is contemned. And ſo take your dirt back again into your own faces which you caſt at ours, *Whoſoever will pertinaciouſly perſiſt in this opinion of Anabaptiſts, and practice it accordingly, they pollute the blond of the everlaſting Teſtament*; and in the Apoſtles ſenſe; *Heb.* 4, 5, 6. *They crucifie to themſelves the Son of God afreſh, and put him to open ſhame*, who being once baptized (and thereby planted together in the likeneſs of his death, *Rom.* 6. 4 5. *Who having once died, dyeth no more, death hath no more dominion over him*) will yet be baptized again? The Apoſtles ſaying, *It is impoſſible for thoſe who were once enlightned* (that is, baptized, as the *Syriac* Interpreter rendreth it, and as we ſhall make it appear more anon) —*If they fall away, to renew them again unto repentance, ſeeing they crucifie to themſelves the Son of God afreſh, and put him to an open ſhame*? How do they crucifie him afreſh to themſelvs, that is, as much as in them is? Why, 1. They are ſaid ſo to do, who iterate, or again do, or reſume that which is a reſemblance or ſimilitude of Chriſts ſuffering, who died but once: for in a reiterating it, we declare or intimate the firſt to be void; and ſo if we will have a new baptiſm, we muſt have a new Chriſt, and he muſt in our Symbole ſuffer, as if one Chriſt, or his once ſuffering were not ſufficient for our redemption. And is not this to *pollute the blond of the everlaſting Covenant and Teſtament*, and to crucifie again the Son of God. Secondly, this may be ſaid in reſpect of reciduation or falling away from Chriſt (as they do who renounce their baptiſm by which they were implanted into him, by receiving another baptiſm) becauſe the merit of Chriſts Croſs being aboliſhed and made void, by which they

Converſio autem cordis poteſt quidem ineſſe non percepto baptiſmo, ſed contempto baptiſmo non poteſt: neque enim ullo modo dicenda eſt converſio cordis ad Deum cum Dei ſacramentum contemnitur. Aug. de bapt. contr. Donatiſt. l. 4. c. 24.

Pag. 245. *Pro τὰς ἅπαξ φωτισθέντας Syrum habere qui uno tempore* (i. e. *ſemel*) *in baptiſmum deſcenderunt.* Ludovic. de Dieu. animad. in ep. ad Heb. 6.

ἅπαξ ἐσταυρώθη ὁ χριστὸς, καὶ ἡμεῖς ἅπαξ αὐτῷ συσταυρωθέντες διὰ τὸ βάπτισμα ὁς. ὁ τοίνυν οἰόμενος εἶναι δεύτερον βάπτισμα, ὅσον τὸ καὶ αὐτὸν, ἀνῳδὲν σταυροῖ τὸν Κύριον, &c. Oecumenius in Heb. 6. *Semel crucifixus eſt Chriſtus, & nos ſemel unà cum ipſo crucifixi ſumus per baptiſma: qui ergo opinatur alterum eſſe baptiſma, quantum in ipſo eſt, ab integro dominum crucifigit, &c.* ſic fere Chryſoſtomus hom. 4. ad baptiz.

they

they were once renewed, it muſt needs be that Chriſt ſhould be crucified again and put to ſhame, that they might be renewed by a freſh, or new merit of the Croſs; which ſeeing it cannot be, the Apoſtle poſſibly would infer that it was impoſſible that they which are once ſealed and regenerate, ſhould ever fall away, and that therefore all Chriſtians ſhould do their uttermoſt endeavour that they may be like good ground, near the bleſſing, and that they may not want an iterated renovation, which no man can poſſibly attain.

Quia abolito & irrito reddito crucis Chriſti merito, quo ſemel renovati fuerant, neceſſe eſſet Chriſtum denuo crucifig. & ignominiæ affici, ut novo crucis merito renovarentur: quod cum fieri non poſſit, inferre vult Apoſtolus fieri quoque non poſſe, eos regenitos &c. Ludovic de Dieu, quæ ſup.

As for the reſt of your revilings, though we have no cauſe to be troubled at your dogged eloquence; yet for their ſakes who are weak, I ſhall endeavour to ſhew the injurious falſhood thereof: You ſay that we in baptizing infants, *diſhonour and make a Pageantry of the Sacrament, &c.* We anſwer to this puted calumny, 1. You may as well in this your *Theomachy*, and fighting againſt Gods Ordinance, object the ſame againſt Circumciſion of Infants, if incapacity of preſent giving account of their faith, as you pretend, can make the Sealers of infants lyable to your unjuſt cenſure: for infants could then no more give an account of their faith then now they can. 2. Infants have a capacity of the holy Ghoſt (as hath been proved in the examples of *Jeremy* and *John Baptiſt, &c.*) yea ſuch a meaſure of ſanctification, and ſo certain a regeneration, working in them all ſuch things as God knoweth to be neceſſary to their ſalvation; or himſelf ſupplying all thoſe things, as that Chriſt both pronounceth their propriety in the Kingdom of heaven, and propoſed them as patterns to all thoſe who ſhould enter thereinto. Therefore the Apoſtles Argument being good, from the extraordinary and viſible gifts of the holy Ghoſt (gifts of miracles flouriſhing in the primitive Church, and marking many receivers to a capacity of baptiſm, which yet might then be had without any intereſt in the Kingdom of heaven) *who can forbid water that theſe ſhould not be baptized, which have received the holy Ghoſt as well as we?* It muſt as certainly hold from the gift of regeneration,

Jer. 1. 5. Luk. 1.

Mat. 7. 22, 23. Act. 10. 47.

tion, and the ſpirit of ſanctification, which is in many infants, becauſe many infants, dying ſuch, are ſaved: And now in your judgment doth the baptiſm of ſuch as are ſaved diſhonour the Sacrament (the outward ſeal which man can give, and wicked men receive) who have received the thing ſignified, the inward ſeal of Gods holy ſpirit, which none but himſelf can give, and none but the elect receive? Or do you diſhonour your ſelf, who were ſo admitted into the Church, the Church our holy Mother, who maugre the Devils malice, and the powers of hell, by Infant-baptiſm bringeth an holy ſeed to Chriſt, Chriſt himſelf commanding us to baptize all, without exception to any eſtate, ſex, age, or condition, that either are within the Church as born of Chriſtian parents, or in their converſion, profeſſion of faith and repentance, deſire to be admitted into the ſame: Adde hereto that Chriſt particularly cautioned for children, leſt any ſhould deſpiſe them, openly declaring, that of ſuch is the kingdome of heaven: And yet the doing of this duty is *diſhonour to the Sacrament, and Pageantry* with you: But, *If of every idle word which men ſhall ſpeak they ſhall give an account in the day of judgment*, it concerneth them ſpeedily to repent of theſe blaſphemous calumnies, leſt it prove a black and diſmal day to them, in reſpect of theſe things for which they can give no better account then their own fancies and others.

Mat. 12. 36.

And whereas you ſay, they that baptize infants *ineffectually, repreſent a Sepulture into the death of Chriſt, and pleaſe themſelves with a ſigne without an effect, making baptiſm like the fig-tree in the Goſpel, full of leaves, but no fruit*: To ſay this is an untruth, is as much anſwer as we owe to ſo reaſonleſs a calumny: yet I ſhall be contented to lay it further open.

I ſay, 1. Can you be aſſured that none of theſe who are baptized in infancy, and no otherwiſe, are regenerate and ſaved? Whence have you either ſuch knowledg or commiſſion ſo to judg? You ſay the Anabaptiſts

tists say so; so said the Pharisees concerning those that believed in Christ ——— *This people who knows not the Law, are cursed :* But what warrant is this for you to blaspheme for company ? Joh 7 49.

2. God be blessed that we who believe one God, one Mediator, one Faith, one Baptism which we received in our infancy, have such a testimony of Gods holy spirit, effectually working faith, repentance, mortification, and a comfortable measure of sanctification in us, as that we know you speak untruth in that you say, that *Pædobaptists ineffectually represent a Sepulture into the death of Christ, and please themselves in a signe without an effect*, &c. God be blessed, *which according to his abundant mercy hath begotten us again to a lively hope* —— wherein as we need not be beholding to you for testimony, so neither are we to regard what you say against it. *With me it is a very small thing that I should be judged of you, or of mans judgment ——— but he that judgeth me is the Lord; therefore judg nothing before the time.* He that saith that baptism is a bare signe only, fallaciously concludeth, dividing things which God hath joyned together. 1 Pet. 1. 3. 1 Cor. 4. 3. 4.

3. Although baptism of infants be effectless to the reprobate, whether infant, or person of years, as in *Judas*, *Simon Magus*, *Demas*, and others like, yet it is effectual to salvation to all the elect, in whom Gods spirit powerfully worketh to faith, repentance, sanctification, *&c.* without which all the waters under heaven cannot be effectual for the cleansing of one soul.

4. We please not our selves with a signe without effect; if you doe, rest not in that state, lest you and your stingie leaves without fruit, withering, become fuel for the fire which goes not out, to fill up the measure of impious calumny. You say, Cyril. Hierosol. car. 2. 3, &c. Greg. Naz. orat. 40. Clem. Alexandr. Paedag. l. 1. c. 6.

They invocate the holy Ghost in vain, doing as if one should call upon him to illuminate a stone or a tree.]

1. I wonder what they will be ashamed to say, who blush not at such assertions ? 'Tis true that the Apostle useth. faith, βαπτιζόμενοι, φωτιζώμενοι, φωτιζόμενοι προσεύχεσθαι.

uſeth φωτίζεσθαι, to be illuminated, for to be baptized, as the *Syriac* Interpreter gives it, *Hebr.* 4.6. *Hebr.* 10.32. and that the *Greek* Fathers ſo commonly uſed the word: and it is no improbable conjecture, that there was an alluſion to the *Hebrew* manner of ſpeaking; who by one and the ſame word expreſs illumination, and a River or Source of water, and by a Metaphor, Illumination of the mind: For they who are baptized by water, and the ſpirit of Jeſus, are in Gods good time and the meaſure he knows fit, illuminated, and find not only a River of elementary water, but of that water which floweth to eternal life, whereof Chriſt ſpake, *John* 7. that is, the ſpirit of illumination and ſanctification.

Chryſ. hom. 4. πρὸς τὸς μέλλοντας φωτίζεσθαι κατήχησις. i. e. ad baptiz. Juſt. Mar. Ap. 2. ſaith, καλεῖται δὲ τοῦτο τὸ λοῦτρον φωτισμὸς, &c. נָהַר *illuminatus fuit*, ut Pſal. 34. 5 reſpexerunt ad eum וְנָהֲרוּ & illuminati ſunt. 70. καὶ φωτίσθητε per metaphoram ente illuminatus fuit. V. Shindler Pentaglot. item fluvius; nam qui ad fluvium baptiſmi Chriſti accedit, illuminatur, invenitque fluvium non tantum aquæ elementaris, ſed & aquæ vivæ profluentis èventre, de qua Chriſtus *Joh.* 7. nec aliud eſt quam donum illuminationis. Ludovic. de Dieu. quo ſup.

2. I would deſire you again conſider, is the caſe all one, or alike, when we pray that God would be pleaſed to illuminate, ſanctifie, and ſave an elect infant for whom Chriſt ſhed his precious bloud, for whoſe ſalvation he came from heaven, became an infant, and man of ſorrows to the death, whom he bleſſed, of whom he ſaid, *Of ſuch is the kingdom of heaven, and except ye become as one of theſe, ye ſhall not enter into the kingdom of heaven*; Is I ſay, the caſe all one when we pray according to Gods word and promiſe, for theſe, as if we ſhould pray God to illuminate, ſanctifie and ſave a ſtone, or a tree? hath a ſtone or tree any habitual faith, or reaſon, or any capacity of the holy Ghoſt, illumination, or ſanctification? Do any creatures under the degrees of man, bear the image of their Creator, in immortality, ſanctity and light of underſtanding? Would God you could be aſhamed of blaſpheming, and laying ſuch pernicious ſtumbling-blocks before the blind to make them fall.

Since (you ſay) *there is no direct impiety in the opinion (of Anabaptiſts) nor any that is apparently conſequent to it, and they with ſo much probability do, or may pretend to true perſwaſion, they are with all means, Chriſtian, fair and humane, to be rebarged, or inſtructed.*]

I hoped that the Plea being ended, the Pleader would have come to himſelf again; but this and another ſtrain promiſe no more but a *lucid interval.*

See *John Clop-penburg* Gangren of Anabaptiſt. cited by *N. Homes* animadverſ. &c p. 106.

I anſwer, As to your charitie towards the perſons of the *Anabaptiſts*: I alſo wiſh they may by all Chriſtian, fair, and humane means, be reproved, convinced, or inſtructed: but that there is no *direct impietie, in their opinion*, nor *any that is apparently conſequent to it*, is apparently untrue, for that which is diſpleaſing to Chriſt, is directly impious; and ſuch is with-holding Infants from him: that which is uncharitable, is direct impietie; and ſuch is that opinion which barreth Infants from the Seal of Gods Covenant with them, and the Communion of Saints; as alſo in that it damneth ſo great a part of the world; preſuppoſing that God had no Church in the world for ſo many hundred years, as Infant-Baptiſm hath been the general inlet to the ſame; except a little while in the ſchiſm of *Pelagians* and *Donatiſts*; and again, when the ſame Hereſie revived in *Germany*, in *Charls* 5. his reign, and now again in theſe diſtracted and calamitous times: much more hath been, and might be ſaid herein; but I ſhall be ſo far from being their accuſer, that I heartily pray the Lord to open their eyes that they ſleep not in death: only I ſay to the Pleader who would ſo courteouſly vail others impietie, Ἰατρὸς θεραπευσον σεαυτόν. — Laſtly, you ſay that you think

Vid. *Joh. Sleidan.* com. l. 6. impreſſ. Argentorati. An. 1558. p. 93. a. ib l. 10. p. 161. b. f. &c.

Joh. Sleidan. com. l. 10.

That there is much more truth then evidence on our ſide, and therefore we may be confident as for our own particulars, but not too forward peremptorily to preſcribe to others, much leſs to damn, or to kill, or to perſecute them that only in this particular diſagree.]

That we may be confident of the truth on our ſide, I aſſent: likewiſe, that none be too forward peremptorily to preſcribe, except where the Word of God and neceſſary conſequence from thence preſcribeth; that none ſhould perſecute, kill, or much leſs for opinions leſs then blaſphemous againſt God, or deſtructive to Religion, and ſalvation of ſouls, (ſaving to Supreme Authoritie their lawful right)

Religio cogi non poteſt verbis potius quam verberibus res agenda eſt, ut ſit voluntas. Longe diverſa ſunt carnificina & pietas. Lactant. l. 5. c. 20.

I alſo aſſent to: but can by no means be of your opinion, that there is leſs evidence then truth *on our ſide*; as any ways intimating a defect of evidence: therefore I ſay, 1. That *evidence, ſenſu forenſi*, in common ſenſe of controverſies, or matters of *judicature*, importeth *ſufficient proof*: ſo we ſay that witneſſes give in *evidence*; that is, not alwayes *in terminis*, and expreſs words, as in actions of caſe is requirable; nor as they ſay, *ore rotundo*, as to ſay, *Verres* is a *Thief, &c.* but from conſiderable circumſtances, or neceſſarie conſequences ſufficient to evince, and to inform to ſentence. This evidence on our ſide you will not denie in this caſe, nor (I ſuppoſe) affirm that falſhood hath more proof or evidence in Scripture then truth. 2. Sometimes we ſpeak of *evidence* in relation to the partie or parties to be informed; in which, not only his or their capacitie is conſiderable, but alſo other circumſtances; as the Informers expreſſion, which poſſibly may be defective; the Informeds attention, for want whereof, that may not appear which were otherwiſe ſufficiently evident. Again, In caſe of Gods judgment over the diſobedient given over to ſtrong deluſions, that they
2 Theſſ. 2. 11. ſhould believ lyes and be damned, who received not the love of the truth (of it ſelf evident enough) that they might be ſaved: hereof ſee *Iſa.* 6. 9, 10. *Mat.* 13. 13, 14, 15. To a blind man, or one that winketh in the cleareſt & moſt evident light, no colours or proportions are evident; becauſe men if blind cannot, if obſtinate & ſchiſmatical, wil not ſee & underſtand.

3 There is a *notius natura*, and a *notius nobis*: if in the evidence you ſpeak of, you mean the firſt, and that errour and falſhood is more known in nature, that is manifeſtly falſe; for the truth is firſt and beſt known in nature. If you mean the ſecond, that is, that we leſs know the truth then the evidence; what blame you in our cauſe, or advantage your Clients? If you ſay we ſee no evidence, nor can the blind ſee the Sun; what can you gain hereby? it may be, and certainly is, that the Goſpels light is hid to ſome, the Apoſtle will tell you to whom, and why, 2 *Cor.* 4. 3, 4. *It is hid to them that are loſt, in whom the God of this world hath blinded the minds of them which believe not, leſt the light*

light of the glorious Gospel of Christ — should shine unto them ——we undertake not to make the truth evident to every gain-sayer and despiser thereof, but say of such an one, as *Elisha* for his servant at the beleaguered *Dothan*, 2 *King.* 6.17. *Lord, I pray thee open his eyes that he may see.* The most manifest light of the Gospel had not evidence enough with the *Pharisees*, whom Christ pronounced blind; and it concerned them chiefly which he said, *they have winked with their eyes, &c.* an unbeliever may doubt of any truth, and then it is not evident to him. The old *Academicks* were wont to question the testimonie and evidence of their own senses with a *quid si falleris?* being not confident of the truth of that they saw with their eyes, and heard with their ears. *Carneades* doubted of all things; yet certainly many things were evident of themselves to those who could and would see and know manifest truths, though not to him. 4. They who deny convincing evidence in Gods Word, not only erre not knowing the Scriptures, but tacitely accuse the Wisdom and Providence of God for mans salvation, of insufficiencie: for how shall matters of controversie concerning faith and manners be decided without sufficient evidence? and if you think there is not sufficient evidence in Scripture to keep us from errour, and to direct us in the way of truth and salvation, in what other rule, or testimonie will you place such evidence as you would have? what in Traditions and unwritten verities? where shall we seek these, among our adversaries? nay, but no man can be edified by that which is destructive; or in *Enthusiasms* and Revelations? but what evidence can there be in those things, whose authority cannot be proved, and whose truth cannot be infallible? nothing less then that which cannot be false, can be the ground of faith and religion: whatsoever falleth below that supreme certaintie, is but opinion at most. Now the Word of God only is infallible, because *he cannot lye, Tit.* 1.2. and therefore his Word *is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness, that the man of God may be perfect, throughly furnished unto all good works*, 2 *Tim.* 3.16,17. ¶ If it be rejoined, that in our pre-

Mat. 13.

Nemo inde strui potest unde destruitur, Tertul. de præscr. c. 15.

ſent queſtion, and ſome other caſes, the Scripture ſaith nothing expreſly and poſitively to evidence the truth. I anſwer, 1 with *Tertullian*, *I am confident to ſay, that the Scriptures themſelves were ſo diſpoſed by the will of God, that they might adminiſter matter to Hereticks; ſeeing that I read, there muſt be Hereſies, which could not be without Scriptures.* 2 That is Scripture truth which the Scripture propoſeth or enjoineth, by neceſſary conſequence, though not in expreſs words; and whoſoever disbelieveth or diſobeyeth that, ſo far he rejecteth the Scripture, in his errour and ignorance of Scripture. So the *Sadduces* denyed the reſurrection of the dead, among other vain arguments, ſo principally *a non ſcripto*, becauſe *Moſes* (whoſe writings only, they received) did not *in terminis*, or expreſs words, and ſyllables, ſay, the dead ſhall riſe again: now though that is true, *Moſes* did not expreſly ſay ſo; yet our Saviour told them that therein they erred, not knowing the Scriptures, *Mat.* 22. 29. where he meaneth not expreſs words of Scripture, but neceſſary conſequence: for certainly, they knew the expreſs letter, yet thought they had not evidence enough from Scripture, becauſe they found nothing there *in terminis*, againſt their errour, which Chriſt yet juſtly chargeth on them

——*Ye do erre, not knowing the Scriptures,*

——*as touching the reſurrection of the dead, have you not read that which was ſpoken unto you by God, ſaying, I am the God of Abraham, and the God of Iſaac, and the God of Jacob?* Well, what expreſs Scripture is here to prove the reſurrection of the dead, that Chriſt ſhould charge thoſe that denyed the ſame with errour and ignorance of Scriptures? Truly no more then we find for Infant-baptiſm, in appearance much leſs; yet thus he who could not be deceived, chargeth them; becauſe denying neceſſary conſequence they required expreſs words: now the conſequence was *thus, God is not the God of the dead, but of the living*, therefore the dead ſhall riſe again.

To

Nec periclitor dicere ipſas quoque Scripturas, ſic eſſe ex Dei voluntate diſpoſitas, ut Hereticis materias ſubminiſtrarent, cum legam oportere hæreſes eſſe quæ ſine Scripturis eſſe non poſſent. Tertul. de preſcrip. c. 39.

—— Secundum (argumentum Sadducæorum) eſt a non ſcripto. Jo Druſ. præterit l. 1. in Mat. 22. ex libris V. T. tantum recipiebant Pentateuchum, Jo. Druſ. ad voc. N. T. com. 1.

Sadducæi) hi quoque tantum libros Moſis recipiebant, Prophetarum vaticinia reſpuentes, Hieronym. in Mat. 22.

Hi ergo reſurrectionem ex mortuis negabant; eo quod in Moſaicis Scripturis hujus manifeſtè non fiat mentio: nam has ſolas agnoſcebant, aliis libris non receptis. Euthym. in Mat. 22. c. 53. init.

To the folding up of all, I might repeat ſundry things which as neceſſarily conclude our Infant-baptiſm, as Infants circumciſion into the ſame faith: Gods Covenant with *Abraham* and his ſpiritual ſeed, that is, all Beleevers: Chriſts honouring Infants with ſacred embraces, propoſing them as heirs and patterns deſigned for the Kingdome of heaven; the extent of Gods federal promiſe to us and our children; childrens capacitie of the inward baptiſm, ſignified in the external ſign: whole Families and Nations baptized, Act. 2. 39. of which children are, and ever were a great part; Chriſts abſolute command to baptize all Nations, without any tittle of exception to Infants; Infants federal and eccleſiaſtical holineſs by their parents, and their own right: But that I would not be irkſom to the prudent and pious Reader, to whom I heartily wiſh a right underſtanding in all things, conſtancie in the truth, and unitie of the holy Spirit, that we may all meet in Gods eternal kingdom of glory.

AMEN.

A

A SURVEY OF The Controverted Points, CONCERNING INFANT-BAPTISM, &c.

THE SECOND PART.

CHAP. I.

Infants of Christian Parents ought to be baptized.

I Need not be long in describing this Sacrament; only I say that Baptism is a Sacrament of the New Testament, succeeding Circumcision the Seal of the Old, appointed by Christ for our Inlet into his Church, our implantation into Him, and the similitude of his death and resurrection, in which the water sanctified by the word, representeth the blood of Christ, sealeth and exhibiteth to the Elect all the benefits

Col. 2. 11.
1 Cor. 10. 2.
Mat. 28. 19.
Rom. 6. 3, 5.

1 Joh. 5 8:
2 Cor. 1. 22.

benefits of his ineſtimable merits, death, paſſion, and reſurrection, to our regeneration, remiſſion of ſins, and cleanſing our bodies and ſouls from them all; though not preſently ſo, that we have no ſin; yet ſo, as that believing in Chriſt we have no guilt of original or actual ſin imputed to us to condemnation: for the water, by the Ordinance of God, touching the body, the Spirit of Jeſus baptizeth body and ſoul. Hence Baptiſm is ſaid to ſave us, 1 *Pet.* 3. 21. the end of Baptiſm is, that being baptized we might be illuminated; being illuminated, we might be adopted ſons of God; being adopted, we might be perfected, that we may become immortally bleſſed. In our being baptized in the Name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghoſt, we do, as it were, by a ſolemn Oath or Covenant, declare and proteſt, that we are wholly devoted to one God in Trinity of Unitie; and God on his part herein teſtifieth, that by this Seal of his Covenant, he receiveth us into the participation of his free mercies in Chriſt, and into the holy communion of his Church, the body of Chriſt, 1 *Joh.* 5. 7,8.

Eph. 1.13. Act. 2.38. 5.31 1 Cor. 6.11. Joh. 13.10. Tit. 3.5. 1 Joh. 1.7,8. & 3.9. Rom. 8.1. Mat. 3.11. Joh. 1.33. *Aqua tangit corpus, ſed Spiritus Dei tangit animam.* *Clem. Alexand. Pæd. l. 1. c. 6.* inquit βαπτιζόμενοι, φωτιζόμεθα. φωτιζόμενοι υἱοποιούμεθα· υἱοποιούμενοι, τελειούμεθα· τελειούμενοι ἀπαθανατιζόμεθα——

Cum baptizamur in nomen Patris, Filii, & Spiritus Sancti, tanquam ſolenni jurejurando declaramus, nos totos uni Deo & trino addictos eſſe, & Deus teſtatur ſe recipere cum qui baptizatur &c. Fay. Enchirid. Theolog. de Sacr. Bapt. diſp. 77.

The Proteſtant Church holdeth, That the ſubject of Baptiſm are all they who either are, or (profeſſing faith, repentance, &c.) deſire to be admitted into the Church and Covenant of God: and that Infants of Chriſtian Parents, being within the ſame, ought to be baptized, foraſmuch as the Covenant and Promiſe of God is to Parents and their children.

The *Pelagians* and *Donatiſts* (long ſince condemned of Hereſie by the Church) and now again of late, the *Anabaptiſts* deny the baptiſm of children to be lawful, until they come to years that they may be taught, and profeſs their faith, and repentance, and deſire of baptiſm, upon theſe and the like grounds:

Object. 1.

Chriſt ſaith— *Go therefore and teach all Nations, baptizing them in the Name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghoſt:*

Mat. 28. 19. *Ghoſt: therefore Teaching muſt go before Baptiſm; and conſequently Infants may not be baptized before they be taught*

Unto which we anſwer, 1 That in the cited place there was not intended an exact and compleat model of Chriſts commiſſion to the Apoſtles; for there is no mention of the Lords Supper: Chriſt only nameth the two more uſual things for making or initiating diſciples for the gathering of a Church, that is, teaching for them who were capable, thereof, and baptizing for them and their children not yet capable of doctrine; that having their names given unto Chriſt, and being admitted into his ſchool, they might as they grew up to capacitie, be inſtructed concerning the myſteries of ſalvation in Chriſt: neither was this the firſt inſtitution of baptiſm; for when Chriſt ſpake theſe words, he was about to aſcend up into heaven: he had ſome years before that time appointed baptiſm among the Iews converted to the faith, and confirmed it by his own reception of baptiſm, not that he needed it, or had any ſin to be waſhed away therein; but to ſanctifie the element of water by his ſacred body, to the uſe and end of baptiſm; that is, to appoint for us a laver of regeneration: and in the cited place (being to leave the world) he enlarged the commiſſion of baptiſm on the receivers part; as if he had ſaid, Hitherto ye were not to go into the way of the Gentiles, but to the loſt ſheep of the houſe of *Iſrael*: but now go and call the Gentiles alſo, go baptize and teach all Nations the myſteries of the Goſpel, as I have taught you: now therefore the order and laws of Baptiſm are not hence to be derived.

—καταχρόμενος εἰς τὰ ὕδατα, διὰ τὸς ὑπὲρ λαμβάνων —ρωτίζων αὐλὰ, &c. *Epiſh.* to. 2. l. 3. ſi. expoſ. N. 14. *ad aquas deſcendit; ita tamen, ut potius aliquid conferret, quam acciperet—quippe eaſdem ſua luce colluſtravit &c. vid. & Greg. Nazianz. orat. 40. tinctus eſt à Ioanne, ut lavacro ſpiritali peccata non ſua, quæ utique non habebat, ſed carnis quam gerebat aboleret,* Lactant. l. 4 c. 15. vid. Epheſ. 5. 26. Tit. 3. 5.

2. Chriſt then ſent his Diſciples to convert and baptize thoſe Gentiles, who poſſibly had not ſo much as heard of Chriſt, much leſs of faith in him, and baptiſm into his Church: it was neceſſary therefore that the Apoſtles ſhould firſt inſtruct them what they were to do in baptiſm, and why: but when the parents were baptized and inſtructed, ſo that there were *Churches* ſetled among the Gentiles;

tiles; then their children were also to be baptized into the same Covenant of God, which runneth to covenanted parents and their children; which before their parents sealing and admission into *Christs Church* might not be: so that (as hath been often noted) we must distinguish between a Church to be constituted and setled, and a constituted or setled Church: as also between persons of years, and Infants presented to baptism. In a Church to be constituted and converted from *Judaism* or *Paganism*, those that are of years must necessarily first be taught, and afterward baptized; but in a constituted or setled Church, Infants are first to be baptized, and then to be taught when they are able to learn: no otherwise was it in circumcision which was the former Seal of the same Covenant and righteousness of Faith, into which we are now, under the Gospel, baptized. When *Abraham* according to Gods commandment, came to circumcise the men of his family, doubtless he first instructed them, and preached to them the reason, use, and end of that sacrament, according as the Lord said, *Gen.* 18.19. *I know him that he will command his children, and his houshold after him, and they shall keep the way of the Lord:* but when *Isaac* was born, he did not expect till he was come to years of discreetion to learn, but circumcised him on the eighth day, *Gen.* 21. 4.

In'er Ecclesiam constitutendam & constitu'am.

Rom. 4.11.

3 In the cited place, the word μαθητεύσατε, signifieth also *make Disciples*; which was to gather a Church both by preaching the Gospel, and administration of Baptism, the Sacrament of initiation, and first entrance of Infants thereto. So these two means are expressed in the very next words of Christ — βαπτίζοντες αὐτοὺς, — διδάσκοντες αὐτοὺς τηρεῖν, &c. that is, *Baptizing them in the Name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, teaching them to observe all that I have commanded.* Some do well observe that μαθητεύειν is to teach them that are strangers to doctrine, that they may become Disciples (and so in any humane school also, scholers are entered or admitted, before they are therein

Μαθητεύσατε) *distinguitur autem à* διδάσκειν *eo quod* μαθητεύειν *sit eos docere & erudire qui à magisterio & doctrinâ nostrâ alieni sunt, ut discipuli reddantur:* διδάσκειν *vero docere significat eos, qui jam discipuli reddîti sunt & magisterio nostro jam addicti: quæ duæ notiones hîc optimè recurrunt. E. Leigh. Crit. Sacr. ex Nov. in Mat.* 28.

taught,) but διδάσκειν ſignifies to teach them that are Diſciples. So *Mat.* 27. 57. it is ſaid of *Joſeph* of *Arimathea*, καὶ αὐτὸς ἐμαθητεύθη τῷ Ἰησοῦ — *who alſo was Jeſus Diſciple.* And ſo the ſame word is expounded *Joh.*4.1. μαθητὰς ποιεῖν, *to make Diſciples — the Phariſees heard that Jeſus made and baptized more Diſciples then John.* And ſo the Hebrews from their word לָמַד *didicit, aſſuevit*, derive their תַּלְמִיד *Talmid*, a *Diſciple* or *Scholar.* So that here appeareth no ſuch neceſſitie of the order (by our adverſaries pretended to) as can conclude that none may be baptized, but ſuch as are firſt taught.

Μαθητεύω, *diſcipulus ſum*, ἐμαθητεύθη δ' αὐτῷ καὶ Θεὸς πομπῷ ὁ Χῖος &c. *Plut. vit. Iſocrat. Interpres Suidæ reddit* μάθημα, *inter alia, ſtudium, vitæ genus, degendæ vitæ ratio.*

Inde verbum Syrum תַּלְמֵד *docuit, abſolute diſcipulus fuit. Val. Shindler. gl. in* למד

4 If the order of thoſe words muſt determine the order of the actions, then by the ſame reaſon, repentance muſt be before faith; for *Mark.* 1. 15. it is ſaid, *Repent ye and beleeve the Goſpel.* So *Rom.* 10.9. *If thou ſhalt confeſs with thy mouth the Lord Ieſus, and ſhalt believe in thine heart, &c. thou ſhalt be ſaved.* Doth it follow therefore a man may make confeſſion of *Chriſt* with his mouth to ſalvation, before he believeth in him in his heart? and indeed if the order of words may determine in what order we muſt act in this buſineſs, then from other places of Scripture it may be concluded that Baptiſm muſt precede teaching, as *Mark.* 1.4. *John did baptize in the Wilderneſs, and preach the baptiſm of repentance*, and *Mat.*28. 19,20. when Chriſt had ſaid — *baptizing them, &c.* he preſently inferreth *teaching them to obſerve all things whatſoever I have commanded.* So *Joh.*3.5. the water is named before the Spirit, and *Eph.* 5.26. the *waſhing of water*, that is, of *baptiſm*, is named before the *Word.*

5 Chriſt doth not in the cited place, in one ſyllable preſcribe or limit the Apoſtles, whom they ſhould baptize, and whom not, but only enjoineth that they *baptize all Nations in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the H. Ghoſt*, teaching them to obſerve all thoſe things which he had formerly taught them: his principal end being there to command them to preach and to ſet to the Seal of the Goſpel-covenant; mentioning no particulars, but intimating, that all thoſe that were of capacitie ſhould be taught; and that thoſe

thoſe that were not of preſent underſtanding (yet if born of ſuch perſons as had given their names to Chriſt) ſhould be admitted to the ſeal of the righteouſneſs of faith in Chriſt, that they might be inſtructed when, and as they were able to learn.

There are two conditions of Baptiſm, Beleeve *and* Repent, *which ſeeing Infants, as ſuch, cannot do, their baptiſm ought to be deferred until they can.* Object. 2.

We anſwer, 1 Theſe are the conditions, If the queſtion were concerning perſons of years to be baptiſed; but it is concerning Infants, on whom no ſuch condition is, or can reaſonably for the preſent, be laid.

2 The argument is impious and ridiculous, as if one ſhould ſay, the condition of eating is labouring, which ſeeing Infants cannot do, let their eating or feeding be defered till they can. The Apoſtle ſaith, *If there be any that will not labour, let him not eat,* 2 *Theſſ.* 3. 10. who (of any ſenſe) doth not underſtand that of thoſe that can, and will not? and why not ſo in believing and repenting, ſeeing that God requireth impoſſibilities neither in things temporal nor ſpiritual?

Ut in baptiſmo adultorum requiritur fides prævia—Sic ab illis qui baptizantur cum jam infantes ſint, requiritur fides ſubſequens, quam ſi non præſtiterint poſtea, retinent externam tantummodo baptiſmi ſanctificationem, interna ſanctificationis effecta non habent. Davenant. expoſit. Col. 2. 12.

3 As in the baptiſm of thoſe who are of years, a previous faith is required, ſo is a ſubſequent faith of thoſe who are baptized Infants, which if they afterward have not, they forfeit the benefit of the Seal which they received.

4 Though Infants, as ſuch, cannot have actual faith, yet have they the ſeeds thereof in baptiſm, covered or ſhut up in the habitual beginning of grace, which Chriſt both can, and doth work in them. Nor is it ſimply neceſſary that the Sacraments ſhould in the ſame moment in which they are adminiſtred, effect all things which they figure or repreſent—yea a dilatory paction hath place, when in the making thereof there is ſome invincible let to preſent performance,

In habituali principio gratiæ incluſam—porro, non neceſſe eſt ut ſacramenta eo ipſo momento quo adminiſtrantur efficiant ea omnia quæ figurant; imo pactio dilatoria locum habet, cum in ipſâ ſuſceptione ob. exprimitur, ib. pag. 209.

as want of the preſent uſe of reaſon is to infants faith, repentance, and obedience to the Goſpel, unto which they are by Covenant bound in their baptiſm: and indeed to be within the Covenant gives the Infant a juſt capacitie to the ſeal of the ſame: Now Infants of believing and baptized parents are within the Covenant, *Gen.*17.7. *Act.*2.39.

Object. 3. *Chriſt was not baptized in his Infancie, although the Deitie hypoſtatically united, dwelt in him fully; but deferred the ſame untill he was about* 30 *years of age: therefore what ever habitual faith or ſeeds of grace can be pretended for infants, they ought not to be baptized until they come of years to know what they do.*

We anſwer, 1 Chriſt requireth not that we ſhould imitate him in all that he did, which is propoſed to us for doctrine, but not for imitation: for example, he was both circumciſed (as being of the ſeed of *Abraham* under the Law, the righteouſneſs whereof he was to perform, *Mat.* 3. 15.) and alſo baptized: if we ſhould be ſo, Chriſt ſhould profit us nothing, *Gal.*5. 2.

2 The time was not come at the birth of Chriſt, for the repealing of the ſeals of the ceremonial Law, : nor was the ſeal of the new Covenant to be inſtituted untill the time drew near wherein he was to publiſh it by preaching the Goſpel, and accompliſhing the great work of our redemption in his bloud: therefore he that was Saviour both of *Jews* and *Gentiles*, was circumciſed in his Infancie, and baptized as ſoon as that Sacrament was inſtituted.

Quemadmodum Judæos ſuſcepit circumciſionis, ſic etiam gentes baptiſmo — ſalvavit. Lilla. l.4 c.15. See Calv. inſtit.l.4.c 16. ſect.19.

3 They that herein require imitation of Chriſt, intimate a neceſſitie of deferring baptiſm untill the age of 30 years, which our Antagoniſts (that I know of) do not practiſe.

4 A bare example without a precept doth not bind to imitation: Chriſt adminiſtred the communion with unleavened bread after ſupper, in an upper room to twelve men only and no women: but ſeeing we find no precept in the Goſpel which commandeth us to do the ſame, we believe we are not bound by that example.

5 That

5. There was neither neglect, contempt, nor danger in ſo long delaying Chriſts Baptiſm; there muſt needs be ſome of all theſe in the delay of our childrens Baptiſm: Chriſt had no ſin, but we have both Original and Actual: he not only foreknew, but foreordained (as God) the manner and time, as of his nativity, ſo alſo of his death: We neither know nor can appoint the time of our departures hence; therefore we may not defer our childrens Baptiſm; they may ſuddenly dye

κίνδυνος κινδυνεύῃ τὸ ἀυτὸ τὸ Βάπτισμα ὑποτείνοντι. ἀλλὰ γὰρ ἐγὼ παιδεῖν ὧν ἐχυρὸν παιδίας ὑπερ τῆς γνώσεως, &c Gr. Nazianz. Or. 4

6. Chriſt would not before that age be baptized, and enter into his publike Miniſtry, among other cauſes, for this alſo, that the truth hereof might anſwer the type preceding in the *Levitical Prieſts*, who although they were received into the Colledge of Prieſts at five and twenty, yet were they not admitted to exerciſe their Miniſtry until they were thirty years old, *Numb.* 4.3.

The Lords Supper may not be given to Infants, by reaſon of their incapacity: On the ſame ground neither ought Baptiſm the other Sacrament. *Object.* 4

We anſwer, That the reaſon why we may not adminiſter the Communion to Infants, is becauſe God hath given an expreſs command, —— *Let a man examine himſelf, and ſo let him eat of that Bread, and drink of that Cup* —— And there followeth a dreadful reaſon, ——*For he that eateth and drinketh unworthily, eateth and drinketh damnation to himſelf, not diſcerning the Lords body:* Now Infants can neither examine themſelves, nor diſcern the Lords body, becauſe they cannot underſtand the inſtitution, end, uſe and condition of that Sacrament: Therefore we do not adminiſter it unto them until they can be inſtructed therein. No ſuch limitation can be ſhewed concerning Baptiſm; for though Faith and Repentance be mentioned as conditions of Baptiſm and Remiſſion of ſins, and Salvation to perſons of years; yet the caſe is far otherwiſe with Infants, who though they cannot (as ſuch) actually believe and repent, yet we doubt not of their Remiſſion of ſins and ſalvation: neither could thoſe Infants who were circumciſed actually believe and repent, yet that barred them not from the Seal of the

1 Cor. 11. 28, 29.

as want of the preſent uſe of reaſon is to infants faith, repentance, and obedience to the Goſpel, unto which they are by Covenant bound in their baptiſm: and indeed to be within the Covenant gives the Infant a juſt capacitie to the ſeal of the ſame: Now Infants of believing and baptized parents are within the Covenant, *Gen.*17.7. *Act.*2.39.

Object. 3. *Chriſt was not baptized in his Infancie, although the Deitie hypoſtatically united, dwelt in him fully; but deferred the ſame untill he was about* 30 *years of age: therefore what ever habitual faith or ſeeds of grace can be pretended for infants, they ought not to be baptized until they come of years to know what they do.*

We anſwer, 1 Chriſt requireth not that we ſhould imitate him in all that he did, which is propoſed to us for doctrine, but not for imitation: for example, he was both circumciſed (as being of the ſeed of *Abraham* under the Law, the righteouſneſs whereof he was to perform, *Mat.* 3. 15.) and alſo baptized: if we ſhould be ſo, Chriſt ſhould profit us nothing, *Gal.*5. 2.

2 The time was not come at the birth of Chriſt, for the repealing of the ſeals of the ceremonial Law, : nor was the ſeal of the new Covenant to be inſtituted untill the time drew near wherein he was to publiſh it by preaching the Goſpel, and accompliſhing the great work of our redemption in his bloud: therefore he that was Saviour both of *Jews* and *Gentiles*, was circumciſed in his Infancie, and baptized as ſoon as that Sacrament was inſtituted.

Quemadmodum Judæos ſuſceptâ circumciſione, ſic etiam gentes baptiſmo — ſal caret. Lilla. l.4 c.15. See Calv. inſtit. l.4.c 16. ſect. 19.

3 They that herein require imitation of Chriſt, intimate a neceſſitie of deferring baptiſm untill the age of 30 years, which our Antagoniſts (that I know of) do not practiſe.

4 A bare example without a precept doth not bind to imitation: Chriſt adminiſtred the communion with unleavened bread after ſupper, in an upper room to twelve men only and no women: but ſeeing we find no precept in the Goſpel which commandeth us to do the ſame, we believe we are not bound by that example.

5 That

5. There was neither neglect, contempt, nor danger in ſo long delaying Chriſts Baptiſm; there muſt needs be ſome of all theſe in the delay of our childrens Baptiſm: Chriſt had no ſin, but we have both Original and Actual: he not only foreknew, but foreordained (as God) the manner and time, as of his nativity, ſo alſo of his death: We neither know nor can appoint the time of our departures hence; therefore we may not defer our childrens Baptiſm; they may ſuddenly dye

οὐδεὶς κίνδυνος τῷ αὐτῷ τὸ Βάπτισμα ὑποτείνοντι. ἀλλὰ γὰρ κἀκεῖ πάσχειν ὧν ἔσχε τῷ παιδὶ ὁ πατὴρ τῆς γενέσεως, &c. Greg. Nazianz. Orat. 4

6. Chriſt would not before that age be baptized, and enter into his publike Miniſtry, among other cauſes, for this alſo, that the truth hereof might anſwer the type preceding in the *Levitical Prieſts*, who although they were received into the Colledge of Prieſts at five and twenty, yet were they not admitted to exerciſe their Miniſtry until they were thirty years old, *Numb.* 4.3.

Object. 4. *The Lords Supper may not be given to Infants, by reaſon of their incapacity: On the ſame ground neither ought Baptiſm the other Sacrament.*

We anſwer, That the reaſon why we may not adminiſter the Communion to Infants, is becauſe God hath given an expreſs command, —— *Let a man examine himſelf, and ſo let him eat of that Bread, and drink of that Cup* —— And there followeth a dreadful reaſon, —— *For he that eateth and drinketh unworthily, eateth and drinketh damnation to himſelf, not diſcerning the Lords body*: Now Infants can neither examine themſelves, nor diſcern the Lords body, becauſe they cannot underſtand the inſtitution, end, uſe and condition of that Sacrament: Therefore we do not adminiſter it unto them until they can be inſtructed therein. No ſuch limitation can be ſhewed concerning Baptiſm; for though Faith and Repentance be mentioned as conditions of Baptiſm and Remiſſion of ſins, and Salvation to perſons of years; yet the caſe is far otherwiſe with Infants, who though they cannot (as ſuch) actually believe and repent, yet we doubt not of their Remiſſion of ſins and ſalvation: neither could thoſe Infants who were circumciſed actually believe and repent, yet that barred them not from the Seal of the

1 Cor. 11. 28, 29.

the ſame Righteouſneſs of Faith. Again, that which is ſaid *Mark* 16.16. is very conſiderable (as hath been noted) *He that believeth and is baptized ſhall be ſaved; but he that believeth not ſhall be damned*: It ſheweth that the condition of believing is propoſed to perſons of years, who may believe, or obſtinately reject the Goſpel, which Infants (as ſuch) cannot do: and therefore it cannot for preſent concern them, without involving them all in the ſentence of damnation; which opinion were damnable and *Antichriſtian*,

Mark 10.14. Chriſt having poſitively pronounced for them —— *Of ſuch is the Kingdom of God*: To Infants, to be born within Gods Covenant, and to receive the Seal thereof obliging them to future Faith, Repentance and Obedience, is inſtead of all theſe. Laſtly, Baptiſm is the Seal of Initiation, Entrance and Admittance into the Church; that therefore we give Infants, that when they ſhall be capable of the Sacrament of Confirmation (the Lords Supper) they may receive that alſo.

Object. 5. *The Spirit acknowledgeth no other means of Regeneration then the incorruptible Seed, the Word of God,* 1 Pet.1.23. *which ſeeing Infants cannot receive, they cannot be regenerate; therefore their Baptiſm is effectleſs to Regeneration.*

Servet.l.4. de regenerat.

Object. 6. We anſwer, The major appeareth falſe by *Tit.* 3.5. St. *Peter* ſpeaks there only of thoſe Believers who had been taught by the preaching of the Goſpel, comprehending under it the Seal thereof, Baptiſm, the Laver of Regeneration, which is taught in that Word as a means of Regeneration.

Non ſolum verbum ſed & baptiſmus eſt Regenerationis medium, Gerh. *de S. Bapt.*

*Object.*7. *Faith muſt go before the Sign or Seal thereof; as* Abraham *believed firſt, and then received the Seal, Circumciſion; Therefore until Infants can actually believe, they muſt not be baptized.*

We anſwer, That if we ſpeak of perſons of years, they muſt firſt believe, or make profeſſion of their faith; becauſe by Baptiſm they are to be admitted into the Covenant of God, and Communion of his Church, to which they were formerly Aliens and Strangers: But it holdeth not in Infants born

born of Chriſtian Parents, they being already within the Covenant and Church, and ſo having preſent right to the Seal thereof: So in *Iſaac's* Circumciſion at eight days old, the Seal went long before the faith or profeſſion thereof.

God bringeth not the blinde into his Covenant, but enlighteneth them, that they may know the will of God for their Salvation: But Infants, as ſuch, are not capable of Illumination; therefore they are not to be baptized. *Object 7.*

We anſwer: 1. God calleth the poor, maimed, halt, and lame unto the great ſupper, that is the Communion of Chriſt, *Luke* 14.21.

2. The Greek Divines were wont to call Baptiſm φώτισμα, Illumination; and it can be no leſs then impious preſumption to affirm, That God doth not in the Baptiſm of Elect Infants, ſecretly infuſe ſuch a light as he knoweth ſufficient to their ſalvation; ſeeing that it is certain, that as God dwelleth not in all that know him, *Rom.* 1.21. ſo neither do all thoſe preſently know him in whom he dwelleth by the ſpirit of illumination and regeneration (until they have received ſuch a further meaſure of the Spirit which is of God, that they may know the things which are freely given to them of God, 1 *Cor.* 2.12.) which appears, in that Elect children are ſaved; which, without the Spirit of Regeneration, none can be, *John* 3.3,5. and doubtleſs the ſoul of an Infant in Gods divine preſence in heaven, hath therein more illumination then the moſt knowing mortal in the world hath. *Aug. Epiſt.* 57.

3. Neither did the Apoſtles their ſelves preſently underſtand all theſe things neceſſary to ſalvation which Chriſt taugh them; neither did he propoſe Doctrines to them above their preſent capacity: ——*I have yet many things to ſay unto you, but you cannot bear them now:* He patiently expected their future abilities; with a ——*What I do, thou knoweſt not now, but thou ſhalt know,* —— John 13.7. which both *Peter* and the reſt had experience of, when the promiſed *Comforter taught them,* and brought all things to remembrance which Jeſus had ſaid unto them, and the *Spirit of Truth* guided them into all truth; and ſhall we not *John* 16.12. *John* 14.26. *John* 16.13.

not believe that God will graciouſly bear with an Infants preſent defect of underſtanding, which himſelf gives him by degrees, and in ſuch meaſure and time as his ſelf appointeth?

4. As Faith and Confeſſion ſufficed the penitent Thief, without Baptiſm; ſo Baptiſm, the Seal of the Righteouſneſs of Faith and Repentance ſufficeth an Elect Infant, dying without confeſſion of Faith, and actual Repentance; and the living, until he come of age and ability to know and make profeſſion.

Object. 8. *With the heart man believeth unto Righteouſneſs, and with the mouth confeſſion is made unto Salvation,* Rom. 10. 10. *But Infants can do neither of theſe; therefore they profane the holy Seal, who give it to them who cannot be profited thereby.*

We anſwer. 1. The ſame might have been objected againſt circumciſion, where the Seal ſufficed, until the ſealed came to years and ability to believe and confeſs. 2. The Apoſtles ſpeaks there concerning perſons of years, it nothing concerns Infants, as ſuch. 3. If giving the Seal to thoſe who cannot be profited thereby, be profanation of the ſame, how often do you prophane the holy Seal? How can any meer man know whom to baptize, though of years, and whom to put by? None can foreſee mens final eſtates but God alone. We know that *Judas* and *Simon Magus* were baptized, though whatſoever they confeſſed with their mouth, 'tis certain they did not believe with their heart unto righteouſneſs. Did their Baptizers profane Baptiſm? If not, how maliciouſly is this objected againſt us, baptizing Infants of Believers, Chriſt himſelf expreſly avowing them as ſubjects of his Kingdom?

Object. 9. *The Seals of the New Teſtament are perfect and ſpiritual: But Infants are carnal; and,* The natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God, 1 *Cor.* 2. 14. *Therefore theſe Seals agree not to, and with Infants preſent incapacity.*

We anſwer, The Apoſtle there ſpeaks concerning the underſtanding of divine myſteries, not comprehenſible of profane

ſane and carnal men: Now Infants being carnal, as born of fleſh, want Regeneration, that they may become ſpiritual, and enter into the Kingdom of God; and becauſe they are by corrupted nature imperfect, therefore they ought to be admitted to the ordinary means by God appointed to make them perfect. John 3 3.

The Apoſtle biddeth us, Draw near with a true heart, in full aſſurance of faith, having our hearts ſprinkled from an evil conſcience, and our bodies waſhed with pure water, *Hebr.*10.22. *Which ſeeing Infants cannot for preſent do, the waſhing of their bodies with the pure water of Baptiſm belongeth to others who can have a good conſcience, not to them.* *Object.*10.

We anſwer, The Apoſtle there ſheweth, what we who are baptized, and of age ought to do, and with what confidence, not who ought to be baptized; and ſo it nothing concerneth Infants till they come of age.

Baptiſm which ſaveth us, is with the teſtimony of a good conſcience: This Infants cannot have who have no knowledge; Therefore Infants ought not to receive that Baptiſm which cannot ſave them. *Object.*11. 1 Pet.3.21.

We anſwer, 1. The Apoſtle ſpeaks not there of the ſubject of Baptiſm, but of the fruits and effects thereof in thoſe who are of ripe years; the fruits which indeed Elect Infants, if living, ſhall here reap in due time; and into which they are for preſent ſealed: Now the outward Adminiſtration of the ſign of the Covenant (concerning which our preſent queſtion is) is one thing, and the inward effect thereof another: As it is alſo in the Word preached, the Adminiſtration muſt be indifferently to all, *Mark* 16. 15. whether ſtony, thorny, highway, or good ground, Gods Seedſ-men muſt diligently ſow; the fruit and efficacy will be to Believers only, *Hebr.* 4. 2. but that no meer man can foreſee. Matth. 13.

2. What Illumination Infants have by the ſecret working and influence of Gods holy Spirit, belongeth to Gods ſecret councel, and therefore not to our inqueſt.

3. Sanctification, more then Eccleſiaſtical, in order of

time doth not always precede the Seal and Sacrament thereof, as may be proved from Infant Circumciſion, but by the Sacrament which implanteth us into Chriſt, and which is therefore the waſhing of Regeneration and Renovation, the ſeeds of Faith, Sanctity, and good conſcience are ſowed in us, which by a powerful and ſecret working of the Holy Ghoſt, ſheweth it ſelf in due ſeaſon; without which work of the Spirit, the Goſpel moſt powerfully preached, and Sacraments duly adminiſtred to the moſt knowing men and women, could bring forth no better effects, then a ſavour of death, unto death and condemnation: Seeing then the effect to Sanctification and Salvation is neither in the Miniſter, nature of the Water, and Waſhing therewith, but in the Ordinance of God; nor in the capacity or ability of the moſt prudent ſons of men, but in the ſole working of Gods gracious Spirit; why ſhould any reſt in *opere operato*, the work it ſelf done? or deny it to any within the Church, needing Regeneration, that they may be ſaved?

Cauſa formalis Sacramentorum eſt ordinatio Dei in ipſius verbo comprehenſa, &c. Beza juncta doct. de re ſacram. q. 3.

Nullam tamen eſt hic opus operatum, ſed omnis efficacia venit à ſpiritu, &c. Dr. Andr. Rivet, Cathol. Orthod. To. 2. q. 1.

Object. 12. *Non Baptiſmus utilis abſq; prædicatione ſalutem inſtituentis. Dr Andr. Rivet. q. 5. Detrahe verbum, & quid eſt aqua niſi aqua? accedit verbum ad elementum & fit Sacramentum,--- unde iſta tanta virtus aquæ, ut corpus tangat & cor abluat, niſi faciente verbo, non quia dicitur ſed quia creditur Aug. 10. in Johan. treat. 1.*

Chriſt joyneth theſe two together, Teach and Baptize; and, Believe, Repent, and be Baptized: But Infants are not capable of Faith and Repentance; Therefore they ought not, as ſuch, to be Baptized.

We anſwer, Here is an *Ignoratio Elenchi* in the miſtake of the Queſtion; which is not, Whether that teaching ought to be divided from Baptiſm, which we affirm not: but the contrary; perſons of years ought firſt to be taught to believe and repent, and then to be baptized: But our queſtion is not concerning the Baptiſm of Adults, or perſons capable of theſe things for the preſent, but of Infants; here again the queſtion is miſtaken, and therefore ſuch diſputes are fallacious. It is true, the water without the Word can make no Sacrament, nor give any ſacramental effect; therefore neither young nor old may be baptized, where the Goſpel is not firſt preached and received: For Baptiſm is a ſeal of the Goſpel; but believing Parents have been taught,

received

received the Goſpel, and been ſealed into Gods Covenant; therefore they ought to preſent their children to Baptiſm, who are joynt Covenanters with them. Again, Baptiſm is adminiſtred with the words of inſtitution by Chriſt appointed; take away the Word, and what is the Water but ordinary water? The Word is added to the element, and makes the Sacrament —— Whence is this ſo great vertue of the Water, that it but toucheth the body, and cleanſeth the heart, but by the Word; not becauſe it is ſpoken, but becauſe it is believed. Moreover, though God taught *Abraham* concerning the Sacrament of Circumciſion, and ſo he was circumciſed and all his Males, yet he circumciſed *Iſaac* at eight days old; & ſo long before that word of faith could be preached to *Iſaac*, he received the ſame Sacrament and Seal of the ſame Righteouſneſs of faith in Chriſt, in whom believing we alſo are ſaved. Men of ripe years were firſt inſtructed concerning the inſtitution, end and uſe of Circumciſion, and then received the Seal; but Infants (as ſuch, not capable of inſtruction) firſt received the Seal of Faith; and if they lived to years, then they were taught, yet the Word and the Seal were not parted in either: So is it in Infant-Baptiſm now.

Thoſe Infants whom Chriſt bleſſed, and of whom he pronounced, Theirs, *or*, Of ſuch is the Kingdom of heaven; *were ſuch as were fit to be taught: for ſo the word* παιδία *alſo ſignifieth: And Chriſt in the perſons of children, bleſſeth thoſe that were ſuch in humility and innocency, not in age.* *Object.* 13.

We anſwer, 'Tis true, that in their perſons Chriſt commended humility and innocency; and alſo ſhewed their intereſt in the Kingdom of heaven, ſaying, *Of ſuch is the Kingdom of Heaven*; that is, of ſuch perſons, and of perſons of ſuch quality; for he propoſeth Infants for a patern: Now as they are called παιδία, which ſometimes ſignifieth a Son or Servant of years; yet not always, as common uſe of that word ſhews, *Matth.* 2.13,14,20. *Luke* 2.21, &c. ſo are the ſame called βρέφη, *Luke* 18.15. which without controverſie properly ſignifieth Infants lately born; as *Luke* 2.

——Τῶν γὰρ τοιούτων ἐστὶν ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ Θεοῦ, Mark 10. 14. Τοιούτων ἐστὶν ἡ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν, Mat. 19.14. Βρέφος *Infans, juxta recens editus*, Hen. Ste-

12, 16. Acts 7.19. 1 *Pet.*2.2. *new born babes*; and ſometimes children in the womb; as *Luke* 1.41,44. that which is ſaid, 2*Tim.*3.15. ἀπὸ βρέφους—: *From a childe thou haſt known the holy Scriptures*, is as much as the Greeks proverbially ſaid, ἐξ οὐθυχέων; and the Latines, *à teneris unguiculis*, from thy tender years; that is, ſo ſoon as it was poſſible for thee to learn: ſo *Pſal.* 58.3. *The wicked are eſtranged,* מֵרָחֶם *from the womb, they go aſtray* מִבֶּטֶן *ab utero, as ſoon as they are born ſpeaking lyes:* So *Pſal.* 22. 9. *Thou didſt make me hope* עַל־שְׁדֵי אִמִּי, *when I was upon my mothers breaſts*; that is, very ſoon, very yong. The *Syriac*, 2 *Tim.* 3. 15. tranſlateth ἀπὸ βρέφους, *from a childe* (from thy tender years, ſo ſoon as it was poſſible for thee to learn) by a word indifferently ſignifying *Infancy*, *Childhood*, or *Youth*; but that *Luke* 18. 15. the ſame render by the word which ſignifieth Infants, 1 *Tim.*2.15. *Acts* 7.19. 1 *Pet.*2.2. and *Mark* 10.16. it is ſaid that *Chriſt took them up in his arms, put his hands upon them, and bleſſed them*—which ſheweth, that they were little portable children; had they been of mans growth, though never ſo humble or innocent, they would have been too heavy to have been carried in the arms. Laſtly, there can be no rational doubt, but that he bleſſed Infants, properly ſo called, who took on him Infancy to ſave them: Nor may we think that they are leſs then bleſſed of Chriſt, who are ſaved by his blood, as Infants are.

Ἐκ βρέφους ἀγκαλίδων, ἐξ οὐθυχέων κατθιεσ... &c. Gr. Nazianz. orat. 40.

Super uberatris mea. Montanab. infantiâ Val. Schidler

Pent in שרה

et quod à pueritiâ tuâ Trem. יַדְמִין

Syr. eſt. טַלְיוּתָךְ

That which God Commandeth not in ſome expreſs precept concerning his worſhip, is not any better then mans invention, Will-worſhip, and may not be done: But Infant-Baptiſm is no where in Scripture commanded in any expreſs Precept; Therefore it is no better then mans invention, Will-worſhip, and may not be done.

We anſwer, 1. By demanding, "*quanta eſt major Propoſitio?* if it be univerſal, the ſenſe running thus, All that is Will-worſhip, which is not commanded in ſome expreſs Precept; it is evidently falſe: For there is no expreſs Precept for many things left arbitrary, and falling under the Rule of Decency and Order, which yet are not Will-worſhip.

Next we ſay, That the ſubſtance and Inſtitution of Gods Worſhip,

worſhip, muſt have an expreſs precept for it, or it will fall under the notion of Will-worſhip; but in the circumſtances and accidents it is not alwayes ſo; for example, had not Chriſt ſomewhere commanded to baptize, it had been Wil-worſhip for any man to have inſtituted that Sacrament: but though Chriſt ſay nowhere baptize children at ſeven dayes, ſix months, ſeven years; or though he ſay nowhere Baptize women; yet neither of theſe are Will-worſhip, becauſe the ſubſtance and inſtitution of Baptiſm is grounded on his expreſs command; age and ſexe are accidents. Laſtly, If the *major* propoſition be particular, the rule is well known, Of meer particulars nothing is concluded.

Mat.28.19. Mark. 10. 15, 16.

Ex puris particularibus nihil ſequitur.

2 There was an expreſs command for the ſealing of *Abrahams* ſons in their generations, in their infancie, *Gen.*17. 7. &c. and Believers are expreſly the ſons or children of *Abraham*, *Gal.*3.7. that is, his ſpiritual ſeed, who have no leſs priviledge in things belonging to ſalvation, then his carnal ſeed. And the Apoſtles who were Jews and brought up amongſt them, who were ſealed in their infancie, did not (that we read of) ſo much as ask Chriſt any queſtion what they were to do with Infants: and Chriſt giving them no prohibition concerning them, he did thereby ſufficiently intimate, that he having not repealed the law of ſealing Infants into his covenant, would have them proceed according to the Analogie of the firſt ſeal of his covenant. The greater doubt might poſſibly have been concerning baptizing of females, who were not formerly ſealed, the doubt concerning the Gentiles ſealing, being removed by an expreſs precept, *Baptize all Nations*, *Mat.*28.19.

3 On this very ground on which Anabaptiſts deny Infant-baptiſm, the old Sadduces denyed the reſurrection of the dead, becauſe they found it not expreſly written in the books of *Moſes*, which only, they received. See what hath been anſwered to the Pleader near the end.

Euthym.in Mat. 22.

4 Although we read not *in terminis*, and ſo many words and ſyllables in holy Scripture, *Baptize Infants*, yet we read it in moſt firm and evident conſequence, if we but hold theſe

theſe three certain concluſions. 1 That Children are conceived and born in ſin, the children of wrath. 2 That God would not have them periſh, but rather be brought into the holy communion of Chriſt and his Church, that they may be ſaved. 3 That he hath appointed no other external ordinary means, to us known, for Infants regeneration, but baptiſm.

5 If the matter muſt be put upon expreſs words of Scripture, let our Antagoniſts ſhew us where they are expreſly forbidden to baptize Infants? where is there any ſyllable expreſs, or probable for re-baptizing any? where have they any expreſs precept for dipping over head and ears? where have they any expreſs precept for their long prayers, for baptizing women, or adminiſtring the communion to them? ſhew us any expreſs precept for the change of the Sabbath.

Obj. 15. *That which we read not expreſly mentioned in Scripture that the Apoſtles did, that we may not do: but we read not in expreſs words in Scripture, that the Apoſtles ever baptized Infants, therefore we may not baptize them.*

We anſwer, 1 If your principle were true, it might thence be concluded, that the Lords Supper may not be adminiſtred to women, for we no where read in expreſs words, that the Apoſtles ever adminiſtred it unto them.

2 Expreſs words in Scripture are not alwayes neceſſary to prove a thing which neceſſary conſequence doth conclude: we have no expreſs words in Scripture naming an *holy Unitie, in Trinitie and Trinitie in Unitie*, moſt undeniable conſequence we have *Mat.* 28. 19, 1 *Joh.* 5. 7. Again, we have no expreſs word that the Apoſtles were baptized; for Chriſt himſelf baptized none, *Joh.* 4. 1. *&c.* and we read not where, or when *John Baptiſt* baptized them; yet certainly they were baptized: we read not expreſly that the Apoſtles in baptizing mentioned the Father, the Son, and the holy Ghoſt; but moſt certain conſequence concludeth it; becauſe Chriſt ſo appointed it, and it was of the *eſſence* of the Sacrament: and why ſhould we more tie the baptiſm of Infants

to expreſs words, then any of theſe fundamental things are tyed? and on the like conſequential grounds, why ſhould we doubt whether the Apoſtles did indeed uſually baptize Infants of Chriſtians, becauſe it is not expreſly written; ſeeing that many other words, matters, and actions of the Apoſtles, and Chriſt himſelf, were not written? Joh. 20. 30. & 21. 25. Act. 2. 40.

3 Chriſt expreſly commanded to *baptize all Nations*, in no one ſyllable, title, or word therein excepting Infants, who are and ever were a great and numerous part thereof: and that which concerneth all alike, concerneth every part thereof.

When Peter was asked what was needful to be done for the Jews prickt at heart, Act. 2. 37, 38. *he ſaid, Repent and be baptized: but Infants can neither actually repent, nor contribute any thing towards their baptiſm: therefore they ought not to be baptized. And again,* Mat. 3 *they confeſſed their ſins and were baptized, which Infants cannot do.* Obj. 16

We anſwer, 1 Foraſmuch as Infants cannot actually (as ſuch) repent or confeſs, it concludeth that theſe things for the preſent, concern not Infants; (for no impoſſibilitie is reaſonably enjoined any) but belong to perſons of years, or thoſe who were not yet ſealed into the communion of Chriſts Church, and it is apparent that unto ſuch *Peter* ſpake: as far as his words concerned Infants is alſo expreſs, *——be baptized every one of you in the name of Jeſus Chriſt for the remiſſion of ſins——for the promiſe is to you and to your children*; What promiſe? why that *Gen.* 17. 7. To what children was that promiſe made? what, to thoſe who had been children, but were now of years to be taught, believe and repent? No, but to thoſe firſt who were to be ſealed the eighth day after they were born; who certainly could then no more actually believe, or repent, then can our Infants now: therefore 'tis plain to thoſe who will underſtand, that perſons of years to be taught, muſt firſt repent, &c. but Infants, to whom the promiſe, covenant, or ſeal thereof jointly belongeth, muſt be ſealed as joint-covenanters with their Parents, before they can actually believe or repent: for

why

why elſe after this exhortation to repentance and baptiſm, doth he mention their children? were they no wayes liable to this double precept, *repent and be baptized every one of you*? who? they only who can actually for the preſent repent? nay, but *Peter* knew well that children of whom he ſpake, could not do that, by reaſon of their preſent want of the uſe of reaſon: yet he knew they had need of remiſſion of ſins by Chriſt, and that the promiſe of God was made to them (without which 'twere but vain for men to ſeal) and as firmly concerned them, as their enchurched parents, and therefore he mentioned them.

*Obj.*17. *There appears neither act nor habit of regeneration in Infant-baptiſm, until they be taught the Word; neither any more promptitude to learn it, then is in unbaptized children coming to years; therefore their baptiſm is effectleſs, and conſequently unlawful.*

—μὴ ἐνδιατριπτέως ita ut obſervari poſſit. *Beza.*

We anſwer, 1 The *Kingdom of God cometh not with obſervation, Luk.*17.20. and the internal acts of the Spirit are ſecret: *for what man knoweth the things of a man, ſave the ſpirit of a man which is within him*, 1 Cor. 2.11.

2 If outward appearance be a good argument to the denying of internal acts and habits; you might by the ſame *medium* as well conclude that Infants are not reaſonable creatures: Infants inſpired by Gods Spirit may be ſaid to be Believers, as they are ſaid truly to be rationals; that is, *actu primo, non ſecundo:* and they confeſs and avouch the Lord, in their Parents avouching of him, as appeareth, *Deut.*26.16, 17,18. *Deut.*29.9,10,11,12,13,14,15.

3 It is not true, that baptized Infants have no more promptitude to learn the myſteries of ſalvation when they come to years to be taught, then other unbaptized children, have *cæteris paribus*: for the H. Ghoſt doth not deſert his own ordinance in the Elect; though for cauſes very juſt, yea, when moſt unknown to us, it doth not alwayes alike ſhew its power: as for the reprobate, the ſeal or adminiſtration of man can nothing profit him who abuſeth it, and where God ever denyeth inward baptiſm by his holy Spirit of ſanctification.

Reprobates

Reprobates who cannot be profited by baptiſm, ought not to be baptized, leſt we add to their condemnation: but of Infants ſome are ſuch, and we cannot ſay which of them, offered to baptiſm is elect, and which not: therefore ſeeing we cannot diſtinguiſh them, nor can they expreſs themſelves, we ought not to baptize them untill they can. Obj. 18.

We anſwer, If the *major propoſition* in this argument be *univerſalis negans*, it is moſt falſe; for *Simon Magus* and *Judas*, who were not profited by their baptiſm, were yet rightly baptized; if *particular*, though granted, it would conclude nothing againſt Infant-baptiſm; for by the ſame reaſon they may deny baptiſm to perſons of years: for alas, many of them are Reprobates. Neither can any meer man diſtinguiſh between the one and the other, ſeeing that whatever profeſſion of faith and repentance men make, 'tis poſſible they may diſſemble or fall away. Now we in charitie, hope the beſt, where the contrary is not manifeſt, and therefore deny them not baptiſm, who doe but profeſs faith, repentance, and deſire of baptiſm: and if we can have as much charitie to innocent Infants, we muſt alſo allow them baptiſm, who being born of Chriſtian parents, are within Gods covenant of Grace. And indeed the final eſtate of Infants or aged people, being alike ſecret and known to God alone; we muſt perform our miniſtrie reſpectively, and leave the fruit and iſſue thereof to God: ſo in preaching the Goſpel, *the ſincere Milk of the Word*, 1 *Pet.*2.2. we do often as it were, draw out the breſt like the mother of the *living child*, 1 *King.* 3. 20, 21. to ſome dead (in belief, ſins, and treſpaſſes) laid in our boſome; who know not who ſhall profit by it, nor to whom it ſhall prove a ſavour of death unto death; that muſt be left to God, but we muſt inſtantly preach the Goſpel.

When the Eunuch ſaid to Philip, Act.8.36: *ſee here is water, what doth let me to be baptized? he anſwered, If thou believeſt with all thy heart, thou mayeſt: therefore he that believeth not may not be baptized: ſuch are Infants.* Obj. 19

We anſwer, 1 It is manifeſt enough that *Philip* ſpake to a
Act.8.30,35. man who could hear and read, and was then ſomething inſtructed in the Goſpel of Chriſt: what doth this concern Infants?

2 Infants have now as much capacitie of baptiſm, as under the Law they had of circumciſion; both had faith, as reaſon, in the ſeed, though not in the fruit: and the ſacrament of baptiſm now performeth the ſame to us, which circumciſion did to them: as that was to them a ſign of their receiving into the Church and people of God, ſo is baptiſm
Drun. de relig. Chriſtian. part.2 to us, the firſt mark which ſevereth and diſtinguiſheth the people of God from the prophane and wicked aliens.

Obj. 20 *Faith ought not to be ſeparated from the ſeal thereof; therefore Infants, who cannot actually beleeve, ought not to be baptized until they can.*

See what hath been ſaid *Obj.* 12. to which we here add, that this propoſition is true concerning perſons of years; but concerneth not Infants in whom we cannot know Gods preſent work: but in baptiſm, the ſeed of faith, regeneration, mortification, and newneſs of life is ſowed in them: and all know that precedence concludeth not ſeparation. Laſtly, we ſay that if faith and baptiſm muſt ſo indiviſibly be united, as that none may be baptized but they who do actually believe, whom might our adverſaries baptize, or whom put by, though of years? If they ſay they profeſs faith, there is much difference between profeſſing and actual believing: and I much fear that many will too late find as much diſtance between juſtifying faith, and temptation of ſecuritie, as is between heaven and hell.

Obj. 21. *Such are to be baptized as confeſs their ſins,* Mat. 3. 6. *as gladly receive the Word,* Act. 2. 41. *as give heed to the Word preached,* Act. 8. 6. *but this Infants cannot do, therefore they are not to be baptized.*

We anſwer, The affirmative may from ſuch places be concluded, Such ought to be baptized: but the negative cannot (therefore none but men ſo qualified may be baptized) it no more followeth, then if you ſhould ſay, *Cornelius*

nelius and thoſe that were with him when *Peter* preached, received the holy Ghoſt in the extraordinary gifts thereof; therefore none but ſuch as have received the extraordinary gifts of the holy Ghoſt may be baptized: nay, but though it wel concluded affirmatively for them, that they were to be baptized; it cannot conclude negatively againſt others, that they may not be baptized who have not received ſuch gifts. Act. 10.

If baptizing Infants be grounded on circumciſion, the males only muſt be baptized: but that is not true, for females alſo ought to be baptized. Obj. 22

We anſwer, Here is a *fallacia accidentis*, an arguing from the ſubſtance to the circumſtance: whereas baptiſm ſucceeded circumciſion in ſubſtance, not in every circumſtance: The ſubſtance was; that was a ſeal of faith, and Church-priviledge; ſo is this; that was adminiſtred to all that would join in the faith of *Abraham*, and their children as being in Gods covenant; ſo muſt it be here: in that was ſealed to the Covenanter the promiſe of grace and mercie by Chriſt, which is alwayes one and the ſame; ſo here; that ſignified mortification, and a promiſe on mans part, of faith and obedience to God; ſo it is here: that was the inlet to Gods Church, the Sacrament of initiation, admiſſion, and engraffing into the Church; ſo is baptiſm: ſo they agree, 1 In the end, *Rom.*4.11. *Tit.*3.5. 2 In ſignification, *Col.*2.11,12. *Deut.*30.6. *Ier.*4.4. *Rom.*2.29. *Mark.*1.4. *Rom.*6.3. 3 In the effect. In circumſtance they differ, as hath been formerly ſhewed. *Urſin q.ſup.* See Reply p. 12,13.ad num. 13.

Though Chriſt took little children into his arms and bleſſed them, yet he baptized them not: therefore, though we may pray for our Infants, yet we may not baptize them. Obj. 23.

We anſwer, 1 If you ſpeak of Chriſts baptizing perſonally, he baptized none, *Joh.*4.2. but it followeth not that therefore none ought to be baptized.

2 It cannot appear that Chriſt commanded not ſome of his Diſciples to baptize thoſe Infants, neither that ever he commanded them not to baptize Infants.

3 If it could appear that theſe Infants were not now baptized, there might be ſome obſtruction and let

which we know not; as poſſibly their parents were not yet baptized, &c.

4 "Theſe children were not brought to Chriſt that he
D. *Featly* chil. bapt. juſtified p. 76. "ſhould baptize them, but that he ſhould touch them: and "that he did, for he layed his hands upon them, and bleſſed "them; and his bleſſing them was as effectual to their ſalvati- "on, as if he had chriſtned them: for Chriſts grace dependeth "not upon the vertue of the Sacrament: but contrarily "the vertue of the Sacrament upon his grace and bleſſing. And that which Chriſt did to them, is more then the miniſtrie of all the men in the world could, or can do in baptizing or bleſsing them; for Chriſts bleſsing maketh men truly and really bleſſed: See what hath been ſaid *Reply num.* 14. *fine.*

Obj. 24. *Infants circumciſed were inſerted into the Covenant and Church priviledges by an expreſs command: but we have no ſuch expreſs command for baptizing Infants, therefore we may not on that ground baptize them.*

Ad Ob. 14, 15. To that which hath been ſaid, we further add for anſwer, becauſe they were expreſly commanded to put the ſeal of the ſame righteouſneſs of faith on Infants; therefore (neither that faith nor the object thereof being changed, in the change of the ſeal) there needed not a particular, or expreſs command concerning the ſubject or perſons to be ſealed, ſeeing the commiſsion was ſo much enlarged as the whole World, and the Nations thereof, were greater then the land of *Canaan*, and *Abrahams* carnal children therein planted. Add hereto, that which hath been noted, thoſe whom Chriſt ſent to baptiſe were ſealed in their infancie, and daily uſed to Infant-ſealing: ſo that they needed no expreſs command, or other Information concerning Infants, then that which they had ſufficiently learned in Chriſts bleſſing Infants, bleſsing and embracing them, as it were, with ſpecial affection to them: and in that they could not be ignorant that baptiſm ſucceeded circumciſion in all the ſubſtance thereof; and that the ſame cauſe ſtill remaineth for Infants reception of the ſeal, to wit, Baptiſm for the remiſſion of ſins. *Act.* 2. 38.

Chriſt

Christ appointed the Sacraments for a remembrance of his death and blood-shedding for our redemption: But Infants, who have no acts of understanding, cannot remember; Therefore they ought not to be baptized. Object. 25.

We answer, This Argument would conclude, that Infants, as such, may not receive the Lords Supper, because they cannot do it in remembrance of Christ, nor shew his death thereby, therefore we do not administer it unto them. But *Baptism is the Laver of Regeneration*, which they have present need of, and whereof they are passively capable, because their Parents are within the Covenant, which is to them and their children; and the Seal thereof is a part and condition of the same to their children, as well as to themselves: Neither was the Covenant on *Abrahams* part fulfilled any more then to halves, before he had sealed his children; and by proportion, neither do we fulfil our Covenant with God in Baptism, if we refuse to baptize our Infants, who have as indefeasible a right to the same as we; the same promise for the main being to us and our children, *Acts* 2.39.

1 Cor. 11. 26. Tit. 3. 5. Gen. 17. 7. Acts 2. 39. Mark 16. 16.

In the Old Testament it was not lawful to offer sheep or goats so soon as they were cast, but at a certain age and maturity of their perfection: This figured Infants not presently to be offered to God, or Sealed. Object. 26. Servet. q. sup. l. 4. de regenerat.

We answer: 1. By the same Argument (if it were good) neither ought the Jews to have circumcised their Infants on the eighth day.

2. Allegorical Arguments, when they are well applyed, illustrate rather then prove: And if you will plead thus, tell us why every first-born of man or beast, so soon as it came into the world (that is, every male) was sacred to the Lord; and the first-born of the unclean beast was to be redeemed or destroyed? and why seek ye further, omitting the type of Circumcision?

Theologia allegorica non est argumentat. J. Gerhard de S. bapt. Exod 13. 12, 13.

Christ saith, He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved, *Mark* 16.16. *without believing there is no salvation, nor saving effect of Baptism: But Infants cannot believe; Therefore their Baptism is effectless and vain.* Object. 27.

We

We anſwer: 1. That wholly concerns thoſe who are of years; who when the Church was to be collected and ſetled, were firſt and generally ſuch perſons as were firſt to be inſtructed in the faith of *Chriſt*, and then to be baptized; it concerned not Infants.

2. That which immediately follows, ***But he that believeth not ſhall be damned***---manifeſteth that it concerned not Infants, who though they cannot actually believe, yet ſhall not all be damned, though dying Infants.

3. If thoſe words were to be preſidential to all Churches and times as a rule, what perſons we are to baptize, and what not; that is, that we ought to baptize none but ſuch and ſo qualified as are there deſcribed; then it would follow, that you muſt baptize none, but thoſe who appear to have a juſtifying faith; for ſuch there Chriſt ſpeaks of, and only ſuch, relating to their ſalvation: And how few have this? and how can you who baptize diſcern this? Secondly, They muſt be ſuch as can caſt out Devils, ſpeak unſtudied Languages, take up Serpents, and if they drink any deadly thing, it ſhall not hurt them, ſuch as can cure the ſick: For Chriſt there thus marked out Believers of thoſe times.

4. He ſaith not, He that believeth not ſhall not be baptized; for that indeed might have concerned Infants Baptiſm: But he ſaith, *He that believeth not ſhall be damned*; which cannot concern Infants, except you will ſay they have faith (and ſo you muſt grant them a capacity of Baptiſm) or pretend that they all are damned who dye in Infancy, which is a damnable fancy.

Laſtly, We muſt diſtinguiſh between an intereſt in, and the effects of Baptiſm. Many thouſands born within the Covenant, have therefore a juſt intereſt in the Covenant of Grace, and the Seal thereof, who neither believing nor obeying, have no effects thereof, nor grace of the Covenant: So ſome put on Chriſt only ſacramentally, and others to ſanctification and ſalvation alſo.

In Baptiſmo induitur Chriſtus interdum ſacramento tenus, interdum quoad vitæ ſanctificationem: primum bonis & malis eſt commune; ſecundum bonorum & piorum eſt proprium. Aug. contr. Donatiſt. l. 5. c. 24.

It

It is abſurd and to no purpoſe to baptize any unto they know not what: Such is Infants-Baptiſm; Therefore they are abſurdly and to no purpoſe baptized. Object. 28.

1. We anſwer: Circumciſion was to *Iſaac* an *Evangelical* Ordinance and Seal of Gods Covenant of the ſame Grace common to him and us; yet that being adminiſtred to him at eight days old, he knew not what he was circumciſed to; yet was it neither in vain nor abſurdly adminiſtred to him.

2. Some myſterious things have been done to them, who though of age, knew not for the preſent what was done unto them; yet not abſurdly, nor to no purpoſe; as when *Peters* feet were waſhed, *John* 13.7,&c. Chriſt told him, *What I do, thou knoweſt not now*---yet was it not abſurdly, or to no purpoſe done. 3. No circumciſed Infants knew what was done to them for preſent, yet was it to purpoſe done to all, either to ſalvation, or further condemnation.

That Tenet and Practiſe, which being put, or ſuppoſed Baptiſm, cannot be adminiſtred as John Baptiſt *and the Apoſtles adminiſtred it, agreeth not with the Practice of* John Baptiſt *and the Apoſtles: But the Tenent and Practice of Infant-Baptiſm being put, Baptiſm cannot be adminiſtred as* John Baptiſt *and the Apoſtles adminiſtred it*; Ergo. Object. 29. *Mr. Tombes: exercit. arg. 3. ſect. 15.*

We anſwer: Here is an *Ignoratio elenchi*, the argument driving at that which is not in queſtion. The queſtion is not whether *John B.* and the Apoſtles did baptize Infants; for in caſe they had not opportunity ſo to do, it follows not, that when opportunity was, baptizing ſuch agreed not with their practice; no more then to have circumciſed men of years had not agreed with *Moſes* Inſtitution of Circumciſion, becauſe we never read that he ever did circumciſe any Jews of years.

2. The *Minor* can never be proved. How know you that *John B.* or the Apoſtles never baptized any Infants? You have been often told, *à non Scripto ad non factum* followeth not: No man can certainly ſay, thar *John B.* and the Apoſtles never baptized Infants: The contrary appeareth in that which hath been ſaid.

CHAP.

CHAP. II.

Mr. Fiſhers *Objections, at* Folkſtone *in* Kent, *March* 10. 1650. *anſwered.*

Obj. 1. IF *Baptiſm of Infants be no Ordinance of Chriſt, then it is unlawful: But the Baptiſm of Infants is no Ordidinance of Chriſt*: Ergo.

We deny the *Minor.*

Object 2. *If the Baptiſm of Infants is not ordained in the New Teſtament of Chriſt, then it is no Ordinance of Chriſt: But it is not ordained in the New Teſtament of Chriſt*; Ergo, &c.

We deny the *Minor.*

Object. 3. *If it be ordained in the Teſtament of Chriſt, then it is to be found where*; Ergo, *&c.*

We anſwer: 1. The *minor* is again denyed; for the matter in queſtion is to be found in ſeveral places, from firm and good conſequence.

2. If otherwiſe, you argue negatively from Scriptures in reſpect of expreſs terms. We further ſay: 1. That the like reaſon might be urged againſt baptizing of women, and adminiſtring the Lords Supper to them, there being no expreſs or particular precept *in terminis* for either; nor expreſs example of the latter, nor promiſe to it in all the Scripture: And if you ſay women are comprehended in the general precepts; we anſwer, ſo are Infants of believing Parents, as parts of Families and Nations: If you ſay women are admitted to the Communion, becauſe Chriſt dyed for them as well as men: We ſay ſo to; and that he as certainly dyed for Infants. 2. The command for baptizing Infants, is *Matth.*28. 19. The examples, *Acts* 16 33. 1 *Cor.*1.16. And the promiſe, *Acts* 2. 39.

*Object.*4. *If Infant-Baptiſm be an Ordinance of Chriſt, then it is expreſly ſet down: But it is not expreſly ſet down*; Ergo, *&c.*

We anſwer: 1. If the queſtion be concerning the example

ample of Chriſt or his Diſciples baptizing Infants; and you would reaſon thus, They did never baptize Infants, becauſe it is not expreſly written: We have often ſaid, *a non ſcripto ad non factum, non valet argumentum*: Chriſt and his Apoſtles did many things which are not expreſly written.

2. We may underſtand this word (*Expreſly*) to ſignifie either a writing *in terminis*; that is, ſo many words and ſyllables (*Go and Baptize Infants*) if you would have it ſo ſtrictly underſtood, that it is not the Ordinance of *Chriſt* that any ſhould be baptized, but ſuch as are ſo mentioned in Scriptures; then you muſt alſo conclude, that the Baptiſm of women is no Ordinance of Chriſt (and indeed there might appear more colour of doubting concerning their baptizing, who were not ſealed under the Law, then of male Infants which were) and then giving the *Euchariſt* to women muſt be no Ordinance of Chriſt; nay, baptizing of men and women of ripe years, muſt then be no Ordinance of Chriſt; for where can you ſhew us, where *Chriſt expreſly* ſaid, *Go and baptize men and women of ripe years?* Where can you ſhew us *in terminis*, *Thou* Thomas, John, Andrew, *&c. ſhalt be baptized and ſaved*? This you will put upon neceſſary conſequence, where you have no expreſs word: And why ſhall we not have the like liberty for *Infant-Baptiſm*? Or we may underſtand this word (*Expreſly*) in a greater latitude, to import a general and implicite command in ſuch terms and grounds, *quibus poſitis, alia neceſſariò conſequuntur*: So we ſay *Chriſt expreſly* commanded Infant-Baptiſm, where he ſaid, without any limitation or exception to Infants, *Go baptize all Nations*: whereof Infants then and ever were, and are a great part; becauſe (except in caſe of ſome evident incapacity) *eadem eſt ratio partis & totius*.

3. Taking (*Expreſly*) in a proper and ſtrict ſenſe, as it ſeems you here do, for (*in terminis*) ſo many words and ſyllables: We ſay from other inſtances, that your aſſertion may appear falſe and erroneous: For 1. There is no expreſs place of *Scripture* which nameth three *perſons in the*

unity of the Deity, which yet we must believe; again, there is no *Expreſs* Precept for abrogating the *Jewiſh Sabbath*, and religious obſervation of the *Chriſtian Sabbath*, as hath been noted.

Object. 5. *If* Matth. 28.19. *Chriſt gave Commiſſion to teach thoſe whom they were to baptize; then not to baptize Infants: But* Matth 28. 19. *he gave commiſſion to teach thoſe they were to baptize: Therefore there he gave no commiſſion to baptize infants.*

1. We anſwer: Your *major* is *Amphibologicæ*: For it is doubtful whether you affirm by (*thoſe whom they were to baptize*) all thoſe, or only ſome of thoſe: If you mean *All*, your *minor* is falſe: For *Chriſt* gave them no commiſſion to teach Infants, as ſuch, though he gave them commiſſion to baptize them into future faith and obedience: If you mean thus, *Chriſt* gave commiſſion, *Matth.* 28.19, 20. to teach ſome of thoſe whom they were to baptize; therefore *he gave them not Commiſſion to baptize Infants*: then the *Sequel* of your *major* is lame, and cannot follow; for though *Chriſt* there gave them commiſſion to teach and baptize the Parents firſt; it follows not thence, that therefore he gave them not commiſſion to baptize their Infants; but contrarywiſe he therefore gave them commiſſion to baptize the Infants of ſuch: For the Parents being taught and ſealed, entituled their children to the Seal of the ſame Promiſe and Covenant of God, which is joyntly to ſealed Parents and their Children, *Gen.* 17.7. and ſo Chriſt commanded them to teach thoſe who were capable of doctrine, and only to baptize them who were capable of Baptiſm only, as Infants.

2. Chriſt not repeating there an exact copy of his commiſſion formerly given them at ſundry times, and on ſundry occaſions (for there he mentioneth not any particular heads of doctrine or diſcipline, nor ſo much as the *Euchariſt*) but to thoſe things relateth in general, *verſe* 20. *Teaching them to obſerve all things whatſoever I have commanded you*—whereof he nameth the two firſt and and moſt uſual things, —*Teaching and Baptizing*, for the making of Diſci-

ples

ciples, and gathering a Church of all Nations: So that he nameth not here the matter or ſubject of baptiſm in particular; but ſaith in general —— *Baptizing them &c. Teaching them to obſerve all, &c.* Now although children cannot be firſt taught before they are baptized, as ſuch, as their Parents might and ought to be, yet might they be firſt baptized, and in due time taught, as Chriſt commanded. And it is here to be noted, That children of ſealed Parents were called Diſciples, and ſo accounted in both Teſtaments: See *Acts* 15. 10. *John* 9. 28. *We are Moſes Diſciples*, —— ſaid the Jews: Now the only thing which entred them into the School of *Moſes*, or denominated them *Moſes Diſciples*, was their *Circumciſion* in their infancy, which obliged them coming to years, to the obſervation of the whole Law, *Gal.* 5.3. delivered by *Moſes*. So Baptiſm of Infants doth not *anticipate* profeſſion of Chriſtianity, but oblige unto it in due time; and therefore is Baptiſm a ſign that the baptiſed profeſſeth himſelf a Diſciple of *Chriſt*, who appointed it as a mark and cognizance of his Diſciples: Baptiſm makes Infants Diſciples in the firſt form of his School, into which they are thereby entred, though not actually for the preſent taught, becauſe they are not yet capable of Doctrine: Yet ſo is fulfilled in Infants-Baptiſm that ſame μαθητεύετε (in *Chriſts* commiſſion, *Mat.* 28.19.) *Make Diſciples, baptizing them &c.* and children of Believers are counted Diſciples, *Acts* 15.10. *Why tempt ye God, to put a yoke upon the neck of the DISCIPLES?* What yoke? Why *Circumciſion*; as appears *Verſe* 1. Now thoſe upon whom the falſe Teachers would have laid this yoke, are called by the Apoſtle *DISCIPLES:* and that yoke of *Circumciſion* was put upon children moſt commonly, in reſpect of whom the *Proſelytes* were very few: And there is no great doubt but that thoſe falſe Maſters who would have grown Diſciples circumciſed, as much, at leaſt, urged, that their children ſhould be circumciſed; therefore Infants were accounted Diſciples. And I ſee not but that Chriſt ſpake of Infants, *Matth.* 10. 42. as well as others——

See anſwer to Obj. 1. num. 3.

Whoſoever ſhall give to drink, unto one of theſe little ones —— in the name of a DISCIPLE, that is, as is interpreted, *Mark* 9.41. ——*becauſe ye belong to Chriſt* (as do baptized Infants) and ſo *Matth.* 18.5. *Whoſo ſhall receive one ſuch little child in my name, receiveth me* ——that is, a childe which is a *Chriſtian*: Nor do the following words, *v.*6. (*Whoſo ſhall offend one of theſe little ones, which* (as our common tranſlation hath it) *believe in me*) conclude that he ſpake there only of ſuch as were little in their own eyes; that is, humble (as 1 *Sam.* 15.17.) though of years, or of ſuch children as were of years to believe: for the words may as wel be tranſlated, *One of theſe little ones of thoſe that believe in me*; or of *believers in me*; that is, any infant of a *Believer* or *Chriſtian*.

τῶν μικρῶν, τ᾽ τῶν πιστευόντων εἰς ἐμὲ, Mat. 18.6.

3. Chriſt *Matth* 28.19,20. ſpake concerning the plantation of Chriſtian Faith and Converſion of nations, in which work preaching muſt go before Baptiſm. So was it in the beginning, and ſo muſt we do now, if we were ſent to convert *Turks*, *Pagans*, or *Jews*: but where the Goſpel is planted, and believing Parents are received into the *Church by baptiſm*; their children are firſt to be baptized, and afterwards taught, ſo ſoon as they are able to learn; So that the cited place can conclude no more, then that adminiſtration of baptiſm began firſt on the Parents that received the word, and were made diſciples by baptiſm, and ſo it deſcended to their children: So was it in circumciſion.

4 Children are to be taught when they are capable, concludeth nothing againſt their preſent baptizing, of which they are paſſively capable: one affirmative excludeth not another thereto ſubordinate: nor do affirmative precepts which bind *alwayes*, *bind to all and every particular time*, as negatives do: *teaching them* therefore concludeth not a preſent teaching the baptized, but a duty of teaching them as they became capable of being taught.

Mr Cobbet. part 2. *exp. on Matth.* 28. *page* 179.

5 The particle αὐτοὺς relateth to ἔθνη in general and indefinitely, though it agree not Grammatically with it: for Chriſt ſaith not baptize *ſome*, or *only thoſe who are taught* (in deed ſuch a determination of the ſubject, would have excluded Infants, as ſuch, from baptiſm,) but βαπτίζοντες αὐτοὺς, *baptizing*

zing them; that is, men, women, and children of believers and baptized Parents of all Nations: it is not now as when Religion was, as it were, ſhut up in *Judea*; now the ſtop of the *partition wall* is broken down; now Chriſt will Eph. 2. have *all Nations* come and be ſealed into the Covenant of his free grace and mercie: and this *Enallagie* or change of *Gender* is often found in Scripture, as *Rev.* 2. 26, 27. *Rev.* 19.15. *Act.*15.17. *Act.*26.17. *Act.* 21. 25. *Eph.*2.11. So here he ſaith collectively, teach, or diſciple πάντα τὰ ἔθνη, and diſtributively, βαπτίζοντες αὐτοὺς, *baptizing them*, one by one, of what Nation ſoever they are. So *Mat.* 25. 32. *before him ſhall be gathered* πάντα τὰ ἔθνη, καὶ ἀφορίσει αὐτοὺς — *all Nations, and he ſhall ſeparate them one from another*; ſome on the right hand and ſome on the left; but *all* by particulars muſt be diſtributed without exception of any perſon, age, or condition: otherwiſe it might ſeem that *ſome Nations* ſhould be gathered to judgment, and not ſome others; which cannot be, becauſe God is impartially juſt.

Obj. 6. *If the children of Iſrael had only a ceremonial holineſs, then the pretence from circumciſion to baptiſm of Infants is invalid: but the children of Iſrael had only a ceremonial holineſs*; ergo, *&c.*

The *minor* being denyed, was thus attempted to be proved:

If the Covenant Gen.17.7. &c. *was only for the land of Canaan, then the Iſraelites had only a ceremonial holineſs: but the Covenant* Gen.17.7.&c. *was only for the land of Canaan*; ergo, *&c.*

We anſwer, 1 If by *ceremonial*, you mean *federal holineſs* as appertaining (by Gods Promiſe and Covenant with *Abraham* and his carnal ſeed) to ſome of the *Iſraelites*, not of the election to ſalvation, it may be granted you without prejudice to our cauſe that ſuch carnal *Iſraelites* had only a ceremonial holineſs; not becauſe Gods covenant held forth no more then external and temporal things unto them; but becauſe through unbelief they apprehended no more. But if the propoſition be univerſal, as alſo relating to the

the chief and beſt part of *Iſrael*, to wit, the Elect, for whoſe ſakes others enjoyed ſecular bleſſings with them; then your *minor* is apparently falſe; for they had internal circumciſion of the heart, as well as the external in the fleſh, *Deut.* 10.16. *Deut.* 30.6. *Rom.* 2.29. *Jer.* 4.4.

See Cloppenburg, Gangren. of Anabapt. &c. N. 3.

2 To ſay that God made no promiſe of ſpiritual things in the covenant of the Old Teſtament is evidently falſe, as appears *Gen.* 17.7. 2 *Cor.* 6. 18. *I will be a father unto you, and ye ſhall be my ſons and my daughters, ſaith the Lord Almighty.* See alſo *Joh.* 1.12,13. 1 *Joh.* 3.1,2,8,9. 1 *Joh.* 2. 25. God covenanted *Gen.* 17.7. to be their God, and repeateth it, *Lev.* 26. 12. and applyed it to the Gentiles, 2 *Cor.* 6.16. *Jer.* 31.1,2. 2 *Cor.* 6.18. *Act.* 2.39. whence it may clearly appear that the main ſubſtance of the covenant and promiſe of God, with and to *Abraham* and his ſeed, was for eternal life, as alſo in the New Teſtament, 1 *Joh.* 2. 25. The land of *Canaan*, and other ſecular bleſſings were promiſed as other temporal goods ſubordinate, and as a παρέπιξη or additament over and above, or an acceſſion to the main, as *Mat.* 6.33. & 1 *King.* 3.10, 11,13. and alſo for a figure of their heavenly inheritance, *Heb.* 4. 8, 9, 11. and for a confirmation of their intereſt therein, to which they were to come through the red ſea which figured our baptiſm.

3 If the Covenant of God with *Abraham* and his ſpiritual ſeed, that is, Believers, had been only for the land of *Canaan*, and temporal bleſsings there into be enjoyed, then that gracious Covenant had entitled him to no more then many wicked enemies of God, and mere reprobates had, and at this hour have: for the impious *Canaanites* then had all that good land and the temporal profits thereof, as the more impious Turks now have; as it is written *Pſal.* 73. 12. *Behold theſe are the ungodly who proſper in the world, they encreaſe in riches*: but this were fooliſh to affirm, and againſt the whole Analogie of Scriptures, which expreſly affirm that *godlineſs hath the promiſe of this life that now is, and of that which is to come*, 1 Tim. 4.8.

The

The ſeal of Circumciſion was ſet to Abraham *to ſeal him up only to the honour of the Father of the faithful, that is, under the notion only (as a ſeal) to honour him as the Father of the faithful, &c.* Obj. 7.

We anſwer, This makes nothing to the proof of the former aſſertion; yet we ſay, it was not only to *ſeal* this honour unto him, but for a *ſeal of the righteouſneſs of faith*, *Rom.*4.11. and to ſeal him perſonally, or to his own perſonal intereſt in Chriſt to come, as it is written, *Abraham rejoiced to ſee my day*, Joh.8.56.

That which was ſet only to honour the greatneſs of Abrahams *faith, not to ſtrengthen the weakneſs of his faith, was ſet to him only as a ſeal to honour him as the father of the faithful: But Circumciſion was ſet only to honour the greatneſſe of his faith, not to ſtrengthen the weakneſſe of his faith.* ergo, *&c.* Obj.8.

We anſwer to this *caption* and weak argument That *Abrahams* circumciſion was ſet both to confirm his ſtrong faith, and alſo to carry a remembrance thereof to poſterity, and to confirm that which was weak; for faith hath certain degrees, and the greateſt meaſure thereof may be greatned (becauſe it is not infinite) and ſo more confirmed. *Abrahams* circumciſion. *Gen*, 17.23,24,26. was a *ſeal of the righteouſneſſe of faith which he had being yet uncircumciſed, that he might be the father of all them that believe, though they be not circumciſed, that righteouſneſs might be imputed to them alſo. Rom.*4. 11. his faith preceded the ſeal who believed in hope, that he might become the father of many Nations. *Rom.* 4. 18. this was when God ſpake to him, *Gen.*15.6. *and he not weak in faith — being fully perſwaded, &c. Rom.*4.21. of what? See *Gen.* 15.4, 5, 6. *ſo ſhall thy ſeed be; and he believed in the Lord* — he was afterward circumiſed, *Gen.*17.24. and his great tryal of faith Gen.22. was ſome years after his circumciſion: and then to confirm his faith yet more, the Lord ſaid *Gen.*22.16. *By my ſelf have I ſworn — bleſſing I will bleſſe thee, and multiplying I will multiply thy ſeed as the ſtars of heaven, and in thy ſeed ſhall all the Nations of the earth be bleſſed, Gen.* 22.17,18 and the

effect

effect of this faith the Apoſtle magnifieth, *Heb.*11.17 *by faith Abraham when he was tryed offered up Iſaac*--and mentioning the ſame, *Heb.*6.13,16,17. he ſaith, *an oath for confirmation is to them and end of all ſtrife: wherein God to ſhew more abundantly unto the heirs of Promiſe the immutabilitie of his counſel, confirmed it by an oath:* what in reſpect of Gods truth? nay, but nothing can be added to an infinite: ſuch is Gods truth, which is no accident in him, but his eſſence; for whatſoever is in God, is God: it was therefore that the heirs of promiſe (of which number you will allow *Abraham* to be one) might be confirmed, and *have ſtrong conſolation* to lay hold upon the hope ſet before them: whence it appeareth that even *Abrahams ſtrong faith* might be confirmed; and ſo his circumciſion had other ends then to honour him as the father of the faithful: nor is that of any better value which was farther objected to the ſame end.

Heb.6.18.

*Obj.*9. *That which was not ſet to any of his poſterity to confirm them in their faith, was ſet only to Abraham to honor his faith, &c*

That. What? the ſeal of circumciſion? Your *minor* is ſo falſe that it needs no more confutation then denial; for circumciſion the ſeal of the righteouſneſs of faith was ſet to *Abrahams* ſeed and poſteritie to confirm them in the ſame faith, and to aſſure them that God was their God, as he promiſed *Gen.*17.7. and indeed *Abraham* was not ſtiled *the Father of the faithful* in regard of *Iſraels* carnal propagation; for *that which is born of the fleſh is fleſh, Joh.*3.6. and *they which are of the faith, the ſame are the children of Abraham, Gal.*3.7. nor as the firſt believer; for many others believed before him, as *Abel, Enoch, Noah, Shem, &c.* moreover *Father* is uſed by the Hebrews to ſignifie divers relations, as *Prince* or *Lord*, 2 *King.*5.13. *firſt teacher*, 1 *Cor.*4.14. *God our heavenly father, Deut.*3.2. *Mat.*6. *Iſa.*9.6. or *Maſter*, 2 *King.*2.12. (hence Diſciples were called ſons of the Prophets, 1 *Sam.*10.12.) or a *Counſellour, Gen.*45.8. or an Inventer or Author, as *Jabel* was *the father of ſuch as dwel in tents, Gen.*4.20. and *Jubal, the father of all ſuch as handle the harp and organ*: but *Abraham* is called the father of the faithful, as being firſt ſealed with this

Metaphoricè אב *pater dicitur, antiquior major, magiſter, princeps, inventor, primus circujus, rei author. & orig. V. Shindl. Pent. l.*?.

ſeal

ſeal into the covenant of the righteouſneſs of faith: and as a *pattern and example* to which we muſt frame our lives in faith and obedience; faith is the condition of our covenant with God in Chriſt, made with *Abraham* and his ſeed, that is, believers; and thereupon the firſt ſeal of the righteouſneſs of faith was given to his natural ſeed: and now a believing Parent, being by faith of the ſeed of *Abraham*, the firſt ſeal of the preſent covenant, is by the ſame proportion to be given to his natural-born Infants. Gal. 3. 7. Rom. 4.

In that commiſſion in which thoſe only are meant which are capable of being taught, and to learn, Infants are neither named, intended, nor meant; but ſuch is that commiſſion Mat. 28. 19, 20. *therefore there is no commiſſion to baptize Infants.* Obj. 10.

For proof of the *minor*, which was denyed, was offered this reaſon:

He that gives commiſſion to teach perſons before they are baptized, requires no more to be baptized then are capable to be taught, &c. ergo. Obj. 11.

Though enough hath been ſaid to ſatisfie herein; yet to ſatisfie your inſtance, we ſay further, 1. The *minor* is fallacious, the condition, ἐν τῷ αὐτῷ χρόνῳ, is here conſiderable; without which it is a *Paralogiſm* or *fallacious* diſputing: we affirm not a preſent capacitie or *actual docibility* of Infants, but an *habitual*; that is, that Infants have reaſon whereby they will in time to come be capable of being taught (though for the preſent they have ſo ſlender an uſe thereof, that they cannot apprehend ſpiritual things) otherwiſe we might not baptize them, could they not bear the image of God: to baptize *bells, altars, &c.* or beaſts, were a moſt deteſtable and blaſphemous prophanation of the holy Sacrament.

2. If (*capable of being taught, and to learn*) be taken for a preſent capacitie, and the ſenſe of your propoſition runs thus *in that commiſſion in which only perſons of years are meant, Infants are not intended or meant*: 'tis eaſily granted; but then your *minor* being this: *in that commiſſion*

Mat. 28. 19, 20. *only persons of years are meant*, is a groſs begging of the Queſtion, which is, whether in that commiſſion Chriſt intended only the baptiſm of perſons of years, and for the preſent apt to be taught and learn, or alſo with ſuch Infants of Chriſtian Parents? which we affirm.

3 It appeareth by that which hath been formerly anſwered to *Obj.* 5. that Chriſt ſaith in the cited place, μαθητεύσατε *make Diſciples, baptizing them, &c.* and though children, as ſuch, cannot be taught, yet they may be made *Diſciples of Chriſt*, by being admitted into his ſchool, their Parents giving their names to Chriſt, both for themſelves and their families: and in Chriſts commiſſion in that place, *teaching* doth follow *baptizing them in the Name of the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy Ghoſt* —— which we do, teaching our baptized Infants, ſo ſoon as they become fit to be taught, what Chriſt hath commanded.

βαπτίζοντες αὐτοὺς, &c. διδάσκοντες αὐτοὺς τηρεῖν πάντα, &c. Mat. 28. 19, 20.

4 Though Infants, as ſuch, are not capable of teaching, yet are they capable of baptiſm, that is, of being waſhed with water in the name of the Father, the Son, and the holy Ghoſt, of being prayed for, and of being received into Chriſts congregation; and ſo were Infants capable of circumciſion the eighth day.

Obj. 12. *Thoſe that are not in the cited place, commanded to be baptized, are not to be baptized: But Infants are not there commanded to be baptized; therefore they are not to be baptized.*

We anſwer: 1 The *minor* is falſe: It is there commanded to baptize Infants. 2. If you mean that the command is not addreſſed to Infants, you triſle, the *Amphibologie* being in (thoſe that are not commanded) and ſo that being underſtood perſonally of Infants, there is an *Ignoratio Elenchi* in the *Minor*, we not affirming that which you aſſume; to wit, That Infants in their own perſons are commanded. 3. The *Major* is fallacious in another reſpect, in this word *Commanded*, which may import either *Implicitely Comprehended*; ſo are Infants commanded to be baptized: or *explicitely* and *in terminis*

minus, which if you mean, which ſay again, neither are women nor perſons of years there or elſewhere *in terminis*, commanded to be baptized, though by the *ſeries* of holy Scripture and neceſſary conſequence, it is certainly implyed. See more *Obj.* 14.

Obj. 13. So Mr. *Tombes Ed. Barber &c.*

The Apoſtle 1 Cor. 7.14. *intended by* holy, *legitimacie, not ſanctity: for if it were not the faith of the parents, but their matrimonie which the Apoſtle there ſpake of, then it was not ſanctity or holineſs, but legitimation which he there intended: But it was not faith, but their matrimony that the Apoſtle there ſpake to*; ergo, *&c. the argument for Infant-baptiſm thereon grounded, is invalid.*

We anſwer 1 The ſcruple of the *Corinthians* was concerning ſpiritual pollution by a believers cohabiting with an husband or wife not converted: the Apoſtle anſwereth in effect, that they need not fear that; for the *unbelieveng husband is ſanctified* ἐν τῇ γυναικὶ, *in the wife*, that is, in reſpect of the wife, not as if an unbelieving husband were made holy by the faith of the wife: but becauſe the believing wife may with good conſcience live as a wife with ſuch an husband (for why ſhould anothers conſcience make her guiltie of ſin?) for unto the pure by faith, *all things are pure*, *Tit.* 1.15. marriage, meats, all, being ſanctified by the Word allowing them, and promiſing a bleſſing to believers, as alſo by prayer of faith obtaining the ſame. This he proveth by their childrens holineſs, as from the abſurditie and falſhood of the contrary, *elſe were your children unclean, but now are they holy*, that is, within the covenant of the Lord, who ſaith, *I will be a God unto thee and thy ſeed after thee*: and this he leaveth on a known and common practice of the Churches everywhere, that if but one of the Parents were a believer, the children of him or her, were brought to baptiſm as the ſeal of the Covenant.

Ob uxorem, vel propter uxorem reſpectu uxoris. Piſcator in loc. ſic *Beza*, —*quia ratione fœderis, quod hic ſpectat Apoſtolus fidelis primarium & principalem obtinet locum; hinc fit ut maritus infidelis eo reſpectu acceſſorium ſit uxoris fidelis, adeoque ipſâ ſanctificatâ, ipſe quoque in ea ſanctificetur* —1 Cor. 3.21. —*omnia veſtra ſunt*, i.e. *in omnia jus, dominium & poteſtatem habetis fideles, &c. L. de Dieu. in loc.*

1 Tim. 4.5. Gen. 17.7.

2 This cannot reach to children born of both unbelieving

parents, though ſo born in lawful matrimonie, they were civilly legitimate, for that would make the Apoſtles ſuppoſition void: for what was it to his purpoſe to ſpeak of legitimacie or illegitimacie of *Panims* children? neither could civil legitimacie give them any priviledge in Gods covenant, out of which can be no holineſs; nor illegitimacie exclude thoſe from the ſeal thereof, who converted, profeſſed their faith and deſired the ſame. That which is ſaid *Deut.*23.2. *A baſtard ſhall not enter into the congregation of the Lord, even unto his tenth generation*--is not to be underſtood, as if it bar'd them from ſalvation, or any means thereto ſubordinate, the covenant of God, ſeals thereof, ſacraments, or publick ſervice of God; but that it excluded them from a right to bear any publick office, Eccleſiaſtical or Civil: neither may *Jephta*'s extraordinary calling to publick office, make void the general rule: in the forecited place it is ſaid--*the Ammonite or Moabite ſhall not enter into the congregation of the Lord, &c.* what, not in caſe of their becoming *proſelytes*? nay, but *Ruth* the *Moabiteſs* is rehearſed in the *genealogie* of our Savior Chriſt, and there was but one law to *him that is home-born, and unto the ſtranger*; he may not bear any publick office, but he might be received into Gods covenant, and ſo be capable of all holy duties. So *v.*1. the *maimed or Eunuch ſhall not enter into the congregation of the Lord &c.* what? might he not be ſealed or ſaved? the contrary expreſly appeareth *Iſ.*56.4,5,6,7. *Mat.*19.12. To our preſent purpoſe, the Apoſtle gathereth that matrimonial conjunction between a believer and an unbeliever, is holy, becauſe the denomination and eſtimate being from the better part, their children are within the covenant of God, by an argument from the effect to the cauſe.

Gen.17.13. Exod.12.19. Mat.1.

3. The Apoſtle diſcourſed not there of civil Policie, but of conſcience; and how could it ſatisfie any Chriſtians conſcience to take an argument from the civil laws of any of the Nations? it is notorious that among thoſe, many things were eſtabliſhed by their laws; which a Chriſtians conſcience would, and muſt abhor: yea, even ſuch divorces without the caſe of adultery, as were in civil reſpects tolerated by

by *Moſes*, for the hardneſs of the Jews hearts, excuſed not the offenders conſcience, though that permiſſive law would bear him out before men? Beza in 1 Cor. 7.

4 When the Apoſtle ſaith *the unbelieving husband is ſanctified in the wife*; if any ask, what wife? we cannot ſay in a wife as ſhe is only civilly legitimate; for ſo far that husband hath as good and evident a ground of ſanctification on his part and in himſelf without any acceſſion of priviledge from his wife; for he muſt needs be as lawfully her husband as ſhe is his wife: we can therefore no otherwiſe rationally anſwer, then, a *believing wife*: and ſo on the other ſide. Now ſeeing the Apoſtle puts it on a peculiar priviledge, which is ſometimes in the man when he is a believer, and his wife is not; and ſometimes in the wife, if ſhe be a believer, and her husband is not ſo; it appears that the foundation of comfort here intended by the Apoſtle, is laid in faith peculiar but to one of the two, and not in matrimonial legitimacie common and equal to both.

5 Faith which rendreth us acceptable to God in Chriſt, purifieth us, and all eſtates and poſſeſſions to us: that ſanctifieth marriage, not marriage it; that uniteth us by one Spirit to Chriſt, and is therefore far more excellent then marriage, which uniteth man and woman only in one fleſh: faith therefore gives our children a denomination and right to the ſeals of the covenant as they are holy, not marriage, which though civilly lawful, may yet be impious before God; as where one puts away his wife for leſs then adultery and marrieth another, or another man marrieth her ſo put away: it is therefore the faith and Church-priviledge of parents which thus denominateth children holy. Tit. 1. 15. Mat. 19. 9.

6 The Apoſtle could not here mean legitimacie of children: for that can neither ſanctifie them, nor entitle them to the ſeal of Gods covenant; neither is ſanctification here or in any other place of Scripture taken otherwiſe then for ſeparating ſome way from ſome thing prophane or impious. So perſons, times, places, &c. are ſaid to be ſanctified, which legitimation cannot do: neither can (holy) neceſſarily imply (*no baſtard*) for ſome holy men have been ſuch.

ſnch; neither can (*no baſtard*) conclude a man holy. The children of infidels, and aliens from the covenant of God, born in lawful wedlock, are legitimate and no baſtards; and yet as ſuch, far from holy: and baſtardie, though the effect and product of foul ſin of parents, and the childs indelible diſhonour before men, yet maketh them not ſuch as belong not to the covenant of God, as appears in *Pharez* and *Zarah*, *Gen.* 38.18,29,30. *Jephtah*, *Judg.* 11.1,2. *&c.* it muſt needs be therefore, that the Apoſtle in that term of *holy*, ſignified ſome thing peculiar to thoſe that are within the Church of God, and not communicable to children of Infidels, as ſuch: ſo *Tertullian* ſpeaks of the unregenerate, from *Joh.* 3. 5. *he ſhall not enter into the kingdom of God:* that is, he ſhall not be holy: ſuch every ſoul is counted in *Adam*, until he be recounted in Chriſt.

I. e. non erit ſanctius, ita omnis anima eo uſque cenſetur in Adam, donec in Chriſto recenſeatur, vid. Tertul. de anim. c. 39. 40.

7 We muſt conſider that legitimacie of children (which our *Antagoniſts* would here have intended) is a proceed of legitimacie of marriage, which is, of one man and one wife joined together in matrimonie according to Gods ordinance, as it is written, *they two ſhall be one fleſh:* not they many: and he that made them at the beginning, *made them male and female*; now the inſtitution of marriage is in place of a perpetual law, the violation whereof is ſin and wickedneſs: Therefore Chriſt refuted their objection from *Moſes* permiſſion of the bill of divorcement from the original, and Gods firſt inſtitution of marriage, becauſe he in the beginning appointed it otherwiſe, and the ſame *ſanction* is inviolable. So when the Prophet would recall the Jews from *Polygamie* to pure wedlock, he ſaid, *did not he* (that is God the Creator) *make one?* that is, did he make any more wives for *Adam* then one? or did he at firſt make any more then one husband and one wife? *yet had he the reſidue* (or excellency) *of the Spirit*, that is, he had power enough if he had pleaſed, to have made more: that therefore is illegitimate which agreeth not with the firſt unrepealable law and inſtitution of God, who created but one man and one woman for the fountain of all humane propagation, as it is written

Mar. 19. 4, 5. *Calv in Mal.* 2. 15.

Mal. 2. 15.

וּשְׁאֵר רוּחַ לוֹ

& reſiduum aut excellentia ſpiritus ei.

Gen.

*Gen.*1.27. *God created him—male and female created he them:* both one fleſh, and ſo *but one —— and wherefore one?* ſaith the Prophet —— *that he might ſeek a godly ſeed*: that is, a generation according to Gods holy inſtitution, which is between one man and one woman lawfully joined in matrimonie: this he oppoſeth to their *Polygamie*, ſecretly here intimating that all they are *ſpurious* who are born of *Poligamie*; becauſe they cannot and ought not to be eſteemed legitimate, who are begotten otherwiſe then in that matrimonie which God appointed, which is only between one man and one woman. Now this legitimacie all the tribes of *Iſrael* (though they were otherwiſe holy) had not in the Prophets ſenſe; but they had it in the Apoſtles ſenſe, 1 *Cor.* 7.14. for (not to queſtion more) *Dan* and *Nephtali*, *Bilhah* the hand-maids ſons, and *Gad* and *Aſher*, *Zilpah* the other hand-maids ſons, had not this legitimacie, and yet were they and their poſteritie holy to the Lord: it muſt needs be therefore that it was from ſome other fountain of holineſs then civil legitimacie can give; and that could be none but federal holineſs from the covenant of God made with *Abraham* and his ſeed, wherein he contracted to be their God, and that they ſhould be his people, ſealed and ſet apart to him according to his own appointment: which priviledge, neither the wiſdom, power, honour, will of man, conſent of Nations, nor any civil Laws or Ordinances of man, ever could or can give; but God alone who freely beſtoweth that favour, and appointeth the conditions thereof.

זֶרַע אֱלֹהִים *Semen Dei.* *Unum tantum par conjugavit, quod ſemen Dei, i. e. juſtos liberos progigneret: quicquid ſupra eſt, perfidiæ vitio accæptum ferendum eſt.* *Jun. in Mal* 2. *Semen in matrimonio præmiſſum à Deo.* *Vatabl. in Mal.* 2.

Only believers are the lawful ſubject of baptiſm (that is, *ſuch as appear to believe with all their heart*, Act.8.37.) *but children appear not to believe ſo; therefore they are not the lawful ſubject of baptiſm.* *Obj.*14.

We anſwer, 1 That ſuch are to be baptized, is granted; ſo that you may conclude affirmatively for ſuch perſons of years; but this cannot conclude negatively to the excluſion of Infants born within the Church of Chriſt.

2 If believing with all the heart were the rule of lawful

fûl adminiſtration of baptiſm: who could ſecurely preſume to baptize perſons of years, concerning whoſe hearty believing they cannot be certain: as for outward appearance, that many times deceiveth the moſt diſcerning men: *Jeruſalem and all Judea, &c.* came and were baptized of *John Baptiſt*, yet many of them proved blaſphemers and perſecutors of Chriſt: ſome of them came ſo far as to be profeſſed Diſciples, and yet proved *Apoſtates*: others were ſaid to believe in Chriſt, yet he diſcerning their hearts, *would not commit himſelf unto them. Joh.2.23. Ananias* and *Saphira* came up to ſo real a profeſſion as to ſell their poſſeſſion for the advancement of the Goſpel: and did theſe believe with *all their heart*, or were they not baptized? I might add hereto, *Judas*, *Demas*, and *Simon Magus*; all theſe ſhew that outward appearance demonſtrateth not faith in the heart: and therefore, if only *believers*, that is, with *all their hearts, be the lawful ſubject of baptiſm*; either your ſuppoſed rule of baptizing, leaves it uncertain to you, whom you may, or may not baptize: or elſe admitteth of hypocrites, whom God abhorreth, and on whom Chriſt denounced ſo many woes, and excludeth believers Infants from the ſeal of Gods covenant, in which God himſelf teſtifieth children of ſuch are, and whom Chriſt embraced in his ſacred arms, teſtifying that of ſuch is the kingdom of heaven.

Mar. 3. 5. Joh. 6. 66.

3 Shew us a rule in all the New Teſtament *in terminis* (as you require of us for Infant-baptiſm) for baptizing only perſons of ripe years to make profeſſion of their faith, and at once (if you can, ſet an end to this unhappy controverſie which hath ſo much troubled the Church) put it out of doubt that none may be baptized untill there be an appearance of their faith and repentance; or give us ſome infallible proof, that all thoſe whom you baptize are indeed and certainly belonging to the kingdom of heaven: nay, ſhew us any neceſſary conſequence for the excluſion of our Infants from baptiſm: what? becauſe thoſe of years profeſſed their faith, and confeſſed their ſins? therefore Infants who cannot ſo do, may not be baptized? it follows not: nay, yet further, were there an expreſs precept, *if*

any

any believe not with all the heart, baptize them not; it would no more exclude Infants from their right to baptiſm, then that which the Apoſtle ſaith (as hath been noted) *if any would not work, neither ſhould he eat*, excludeth them from their right to be fed. To conclude, we ſhew you an infallible word of Chriſt, that Infants belong to the kingdom of heaven; and therefore the *appearance* (from thoſe words of Chriſt, and the covenant of God with believing parents and their children) is as good and certain that the kingdom of heaven belongs to the Infants of conſtent profeſſors whom we baptize, as any profeſſion of new Converts can ſhew; for men and women may and often do deceive men, who know not the heart, or future condition of profeſſors, whatſoever they now ſeem or ſay: but Chriſt who knows all things, yea the ſecrets of every heart, and ends of all that are or ſhall be, could not be deceived in ſo judging of Infants. *The foundation of the Lord remains ſure, and hath this ſeal, the Lord knoweth who are his*: and his covenant being that he will be to the covenanted & his ſeed a God, whoſe promiſes are therefore ſure to them; and the parent, as ſuch, being as well known to be converted, as any new proſelyte is or can be known to be converted; Gods promiſe to me concerning my children, is more ſure to me, then mans judgment concerning the ſinceritie of any new Convert can be, whatſoever appeareth in his words, or profeſſions.

2 Theſſ 3.10

2 Tim. 2.19. Gen 17.7. Act. 2.39.

4 The intereſt of ſealing into the covenant of grace dependeth not on the ſealed perſons worthineſs or unworthineſs, ſexe, age, or condition, but upon God the author and free appointer thereof: ſo circumciſion was one and the ſame in the external ſeal, to the elect and reprobate, Infant or Proſelyte of years. The commandment of God did not put any difference, but equally enjoined it to all ſorts of males within the pale of *Iſrael*: he ſaid not circumciſe only believers, the penitent, &c. (though in perſons of years, that was to be underſtood) but circumciſe every male-child the eighth day; when 'tis ſure they could neither actually believe, repent, nor make any *appearance* thereof; as then the

external ſeal was one and the ſame, though the effect in the ſealed was variable; ſo is it in baptiſm; the ſecret unworthineſs or *Apoſtacie* of the receiver foreſeen only by God, did not make them uncapable of the ſeal; therefore man adminiſtring, was to do his part according to the general command of God, and to leave the particular ſucceſs and effect to God, and ſo is it in baptiſm.

5 Though unbelievers who reject the word of God, may not, as ſuch, be baptized; yet Infants, who at moſt may be called but *negatively* unbelievers, cannot be included in that rule which excludeth contemners, ſeeing they have faith as they have reaſon, in the ſeed, not in the fruit, in the root, though not in the leaf; in ſome inward operation, though not in any outward expreſſion, as *Tilenus* cited by the learned Dr. *Featly* well obſerves.

6 None are required to manifeſt their faith and repentance before baptiſm, but ſuch as having the uſe of reaſon, have been taught and inſtructed in the ſame; for God requireth no impoſſibilities in reſpect of the abilities which himſelf ever gave: ſo that in common reaſon, all texts of Scripture which require confeſſion of faith, repentance, &c. are to be underſtood of ſuch as have the uſe of reaſon and tongue, whereby they are enabled ſo to do.

Obj. 15. *If the parents to whom the Apoſtle ſpake,* Act. 2. 39. *were not believers, then the promiſe was not to them and their children: but they were not believers;* ergo, *&c.*

We anſwer, The Apoſtle ſaying expreſly--*the promiſe is to you and to your children,* your diſpute, labouring to prove that the promiſe was *not to them and their children*, is point blanck againſt the expreſs Word of God; and you denying that principle, are not worthy of further anſwer: yet for the pious Readers ſake, we ſay further, 1 That believers may be taken two ways: firſt for ſuch as do in heart *believe unto righteouſneſs*: this God alone can judge of; and therefore man is not to expect his rule and direction for his miniſtration from hence. Secondly, for ſuch as profeſs faith or ſhew good and probable ſigns and ſymptoms thereof, as thoſe hearers of *Peter* did: for they received the word gladly and were baptized:

Rom. 10. 10.

and

and before that there appeared an excellent ſign of faith in them, in that the word which they heard, profited them to compunction of heart and repentance, with deſiring remedie: but where the Word of God is not *mixed with faith* in the hearers, *it profiteth not*, as appeareth, *Heb.*4.2. Therefore that aſſumption is irrational where you ſay, they to whom the Apoſtle ſpake were not believers. 2 There may be an *amphibologie* in the *major*, *believers* being either ſuch only in profeſſion and bearing the external ſeal of the righteouſneſs of faith, or for ſuch in the heart; and ſo the ſequel is unſound: for the promiſe of Gods covenant was to all *Iſrael*, as being the ſeed of *Abraham* within that covenant; although many of them through unbelief obtained not remiſsion of ſins and eternal life held out to them in the ſame: which made not the promiſe of none effect to them who believed; and many unbelieving parents had and have believing children: but a covenanted Parents unbelief barreth not his Infant born within the Church from the external ſeal of the covenant: ſo that the promiſe did belong to them though their Parents had ſecretly been unbelievers and impious perſons; much more, ſeeing they ſo expreſſed and profeſſed their faith, repentance, and care to be ſaved.

1 Cor.10.5. Heb.4.2.

If thoſe children Act. 2. 39. *were entitled to baptiſm in their infancie, then they were, or muſt have been baptized in their infancie: but they were not baptized in their infancie, but their fathers only, who received the word gladly; therefore they to whom the promiſe is* Act.2.39. *were not entitled to baptiſm in their infancie.* *Obj.*16.

We deny your *minor*, and you can never prove it: their fathers were firſt baptized; but it appeareth not that they only were baptized. 1. It hath been often ſaid, and you need ſtill to hear it; it followeth not that it was not done, becauſe it is not written. Chriſt ſpake and did many things which are not written. 2 If you could from Scripture prove that *de facto* they were not baptized in their infancie; yet that would not prove that *de jure* they might not be baptized. The parents neglect of their duty, or any other intercident obſtructions could not make void the childrens intereſt. *Moſes* ſon was

See the anſwer to Obj.4.

Exod.4. not circumciſed on the eighth day, nor many thouſand *Iſraeliſts* Infants in the wilderneſs for 40 years; yet we cannot hence conclude that they ought not to have been circumciſed had there been no let, or that they had no intereſt in the ſeal becauſe there were lets.

Obj.17. *Only Abrahams ſpiritual ſeed are to be baptized: but Infants are not the ſpiritual ſeed of Abraham; therefore Infants are not to be baptized.*

We anſwer, 1 This is the ſame argument under another *ſynonimical* dreſs, to which we have anſwered: there you ſaid, only believers are to be baptized; here you ſay only *Abrahams ſpiritual ſeed are to be baptized*; whereas believers and *Abrahams ſpiritual ſeed* are one and the ſame in the Apoſtles account, *Gal.* 3.7. 2 Many thouſands which were *Abrahams* carnal ſeed, were baptized; which were indeed not his *ſpiritual ſeed*, that is, *true believers:* See *Mat.*3.5,6. *Act.*2 41. which being done by *John Baptiſt* and *Chriſts diſciples*, and ſo precedentially to us, ſhews the falſhood of your *major*. 3 If *Abrahams ſpiritual ſeed*, by your own confeſſion be to be baptized, then Infants of believers within the Church muſt be baptized, they being *Abrahams ſpiritual ſeed*, (except you will ſay that Gods promiſe was to ſome who were not within the covenant made with *Abraham*) and indeed the whole myſtical body of Chriſt, is the ſpiritual ſeed of *Abraham*, of which none can rationally deny Infants of covenanted Parents to be a part, who acknowledge Chriſt to be their Saviour. See *Eph.*5.28. and that out of him and his body the Church, is no ſalvation. So that by the way we may note, that to exclude Chriſtian Infants from being a part of Chriſts viſible Church in general, is to exclude them from the ordinary ſtate and way to ſalvation: and ſo to deny them to be *Abrahams* ſpiritual ſeed, is to exclude them from the ſame, and to leave them to an extraordinary means thereto; in which ſome *Pagans*, *Turks*, and obſtinate *Jews* &c. by the mercie of God, (illuminating & converting them to the faith of Chriſt by extraordinary means) may be ſaved: and this is to ſuppoſe Infants of Chriſtian Parents as bad as Heathens, *without Chriſt, aliens from the Common-wealth of Iſrael, ſtrangers from the covenants of promiſe—without God in*

1 Cor. 12. 12, 13. Gal.3.7.

Eph.2.12. 1 Theſ.4.

the

the World. Add hereto, that if parents may not *ſorrow as men without hope* for their deceaſed Infants, they cannot have ſound hope without faith, nor faith without a promiſe or word of faith, that is, Scripture-promiſe to confirm & ground it on: and that not in general, but ſuch as properly concerns their children, as that *Gen.* 17.7. *Act.* 2.39. *Luk.* 18.16,17. &c. Now to deny childrens intereſt herein, or that they are the *ſpiritual ſeed of Abraham*, is to leave afflicted Parents hopeleſs of their childrens ſalvation, in that by ſuch an an uncharitable & impious tenet, Parents muſt not believ thoſe comfortable promiſes belong to their children; and that God will not ſo much as by an external ſeal, aſſure them that he is by covenant a God unto their Infants. Nor can we think that ever any were ſaved ordinarily, if at all, touching whom God never made any promiſe, neither in reſpect of internal and ſaving faith, nor ſo much as in reſpect of external right to ſealing thereto: ſo that to avoid this, we muſt ſay, that Chriſtian Infants are *Abrahams* undoubted ſpiritual ſeed & therefore they have at leaſt an *eccleſiaſtical* right as to the covenant made with *Abraham*, ſo to the *Church-priviledges* reſpectively; that is, to baptiſm, which is now the ſeal of Gods covenant in Chriſt exhibited.

CHAP. III.

Infant baptiſm aſſerted and juſtified, by ſundry arguments by the Church of Chriſt alledged.

1. ALl they who are members of *Chriſts* body the *Church*, are to be baptized that they may be admitted into the ſame by the initiatory ſeal thereof, which is baptiſm, that they may be externally known to be of the Church: but Infants of Church-priviledged perſons are members of Chriſts body the Church; *ergo*, they ought to be baptized that they may be admitted into the ſame by the initiatorie ſeal thereof, which is baptiſm, &c.

Baſting de bapt. quæſt. 74. *Uſſ. Catech. &c.*

The *major* is thus confirmed; ſuch perſons as were circumciſed under the Law, that they might be known to be of the Church, ought to be baptized under the Goſpel for the ſame end; for baptiſm anſwereth circumciſion; and is called by the

the ſame name, *Col.*2 11,12.as having the ſame end & effect to ſeal up the ſame grace unto faith,mortification, remiſſion of ſins,& admiſſion into the viſible Church. If it be excepted that under the Law, there was an expreſs command for Infant-circumciſion on the eighth day, but there is none for Infant-baptiſm;We ſay, 1 Becauſe there was an expreſs command under the Law never repealed in the Goſpel, and the ſame end and uſe ſtill remain; therefore there need be none in the Goſpel more then that general opening the kingdom of heaven to all believers,in taking away the ſtop of the partition wall by that which is ſaid, *Baptize all Nations*. None but *Iſraelites* and their *proſelytes* were ſealed under the Law, none but male children at eight days old;but now go baptize all nations, without exception to nation, age, ſex, or condition. 2 There is in all the Scripture no expreſs prohibition, neither can any by any ſound conſequence imply it.

The aſſumption is thus confirmed,Thoſe whom Chriſt ſaveth are members of his body, (for he is the head of the *Church,and Savior of the body*, *Eph.*5.23.) But Chriſt ſaveth Infants of believing parents; therefore Infants are members of Chriſts body the Church. The *major* is evident; for Chriſt ſaveth none but thoſe who are members of his body the Church. The *minor* is as evident, it being granted that any Infants are ſaved, which is apparent from the covenant of God, *Gen.*17.7. and the words of Chriſt, *of ſuch is the kingdom of God*,as alſo by this argument: Thoſe whom Chriſt loved, and for whom he gave himſelf to death, thoſe he will ſanctifie and cleanſe with the *waſhing of water by the Word*, *Eph.*5.26.that they may be received into the Church,and be made partakers of the benefits of his death: but Chriſt not only loved and gave himſelf for perſons of years, but alſo for Infants; therefore he will ſanctifie and cleanſe Infants with the waſhing of water by the Word, &c.

Luk.18. 15.

2 All Infants were by *Adam* capable of ſin and the expreſſions of Gods juſtice puniſhing the ſame by death, ſickneſs, *&c.* but Infants are not leſs capable of the grace and mercy of God in Chriſt in reſpect of the expreſsions thereof, then they were of his juſtice in *Adam*: Therefore Infants are capable of the expreſsions of Gods grace and mercie in Chriſt, which

which in the ordinary diſpenſation thereof is baptiſm. The *major* is evident, *Rom.*5.12. 1*Cor.*15.22. The *minor Rom.*5.20 *where ſin abounded, grace did much more abound*, that is, Gods grace doth more abundantly appear in holding out the viſible remedy, then his juſtice inflicting the denounced puniſhment; which could not be, if Infants (viſibly involved in the condemnatorie ſentence and execution thereof) ſhould be excluded from the ordinary and viſible means of recovery and ſalvation by Chriſt, which in them can be no other external means but baptiſm the laver of regeneration: & it can be no leſs then a ſacrilegious injury to the grace & mercy of God in Chriſt, to ſuppoſe that the ſin of man is more powerful to hurt then the grace of God in Chriſt is to heal and ſave.

3 If we ought not to baptize Infants, then there muſt be ſome apparent let and impediment thereto, either on Gods part prohibiting, or on the Miniſters part, or in the Sacrament it ſelf, or in the incapacitie of the receiver; but there is no apparent let or impdiment on the part (or in any) of theſe therefore there is none at all. 1 There is no impediment on Gods part, for God no where expreſly or by good conſequence ſaith, Baptize not Infants, or Baptize none but thoſe who do firſt teſtifie their faith and repentance. 2 There is no impediment on the Miniſters part, for he can as eaſily baptize Infants as perſons of years. 3 There is no impediment in reſpect of the Sacrament it ſelf; for all the *eſſentials of baptiſm* may be placed on children: profeſsion of faith, repentance, &c. are conditions of baptiſm in perſons of years, and effects of it, which may in due time appear and follow in baptized Infants: thoſe therefore are not of the eſſence of baptiſm, nor ſo much as univerſal conditions thereof; for the preſent ſprinkling, waſhing, or dipping in water, in the name of the Father, the Son, and the H. Ghoſt, are the eſſence of baptiſm; ſo are not faith, repentance, or newneſs of life: for it may be a true baptiſm, where theſe graces do neither precede nor follow it, though without theſe preceding or following, baptiſm cannot be effectual to ſalvation; which need not ſeem ſtrange to him that conſidereth that *Judas*, *Simon Magus*, and many who were, and now are truly baptized, are not ſaved. 4 Neither can the let be in the Infant, who cannot by

any

the ſame name, *Col.*2 11,12.as having the ſame end & effect to ſeal up the ſame grace unto faith,mortification, remiſſion of ſins,& admiſſion into the viſible Church. If it be excepted that under the Law, there was an expreſs command for Infant-circumciſion on the eighth day, but there is none for Infant-baptiſm;We ſay, 1 Becauſe there was an expreſs command under the Law never repealed in the Goſpel, and the ſame end and uſe ſtill remain; therefore there need be none in the Goſpel more then that general opening the kingdom of heaven to all believers,in taking away the ſtop of the partition wall by that which is ſaid, *Baptize all Nations.* None but *Iſraelites* and their *proſelytes* were ſealed under the Law, none but male children at eight days old;but now go baptize all nations, without exception to nation, age, ſex, or condition. 2 There is in all the Scripture no expreſs prohibition, neither can any by any ſound conſequence imply it.

The aſſumption is thus confirmed,Thoſe whom Chriſt ſaveth are members of his body, (for he is the head of the *Church,and Savior of the body*, *Eph.*5.23.) But Chriſt ſaveth Infants of believing parents; therefore Infants are members of Chriſts body the Church. The *major* is evident; for Chriſt ſaveth none but thoſe who are members of his body the Church. The *minor* is as evident, it being granted that any Infants are ſaved, which is apparent from the covenant of God, *Gen.*17.7. and the words of Chriſt, *of ſuch is the kingdom of God*,as alſo by this argument: Thoſe whom Chriſt loved, and for whom he gave himſelf to death, thoſe he will ſanctifie and cleanſe with the *waſhing of water by the Word, Eph.*5.26.that they may be received into the Church,and be made partakers of the benefits of his death: but Chriſt not only loved and gave himſelf for perſons of years, but alſo for Infants; therefore he will ſanctifie and cleanſe Infants with the waſhing of water by the Word, &c.

Luk.18. 16.

2 All Infants were by *Adam* capable of ſin and the expreſſions of Gods juſtice puniſhing the ſame by death, ſickneſs, &c. but Infants are not leſs capable of the grace and mercy of God in Chriſt in reſpect of the expreſsions thereof, then they were of his juſtice in *Adam*: Therefore Infants are capable of the expreſsions of Gods grace and mercie in Chriſt, which

which in the ordinary diſpenſation thereof is baptiſm. The *major* is evident, *Rom.*5.12. 1*Cor.*15.22. The *minor Rom.*5.20 *where ſin abounded, grace did much more abound*, that is, Gods grace doth more abundantly appear in holding out the viſible remedy, then his juſtice inflicting the denounced puniſhment; which could not be, if Infants (viſibly involved in the condemnatorie ſentence and execution thereof) ſhould be excluded from the ordinary and viſible means of recovery and ſalvation by Chriſt, which in them can be no other external means but baptiſm the laver of regeneration: & it can be no leſs then a ſacrilegious injury to the grace & mercy of God in Chriſt, to ſuppoſe that the ſin of man is more powerful to hurt then the grace of God in Chriſt is to heal and ſave.

3 If we ought not to baptize Infants, then there muſt be ſome apparent let and impediment thereto, either on Gods part prohibiting, or on the Miniſters part, or in the Sacrament it ſelf, or in the incapacitie of the receiver; but there is no apparent let or impdiment on the part (or in any) of theſe therefore there is none at all. 1 There is no impediment on Gods part, for God no where expreſly or by good conſequence ſaith, Baptize not Infants, or Baptize none but thoſe who do firſt teſtifie their faith and repentance. 2 There is no impediment on the Miniſters part, for he can as eaſily baptize Infants as perſons of years. 3 There is no impediment in reſpect of the Sacrament it ſelf; for all the *eſſentials of baptiſm* may be placed on children: profeſsion of faith, repentance, &c. are conditions of baptiſm in perſons of years, and effects of it, which may in due time appear and follow in baptized Infants: thoſe therefore are not of the eſſence of baptiſm, nor ſo much as univerſal conditions thereof; for the preſent ſprinkling, waſhing, or dipping in water, in the name of the Father, the Son, and the H. Ghoſt, are the eſſence of baptiſm; ſo are not faith, repentance, or newneſs of life: for it may be a true baptiſm, where theſe graces do neither precede nor follow it, though without theſe preceding or following, baptiſm cannot be effectual to ſalvation; which need not ſeem ſtrange to him that conſidereth that *Judas*, *Simon Magus*, and many who were, and now are truly baptized, are not ſaved. 4 Neither can the let be in the Infant, who cannot by

any

any actual hardnes of heart, impenitency, or poſitive unbelief, or contempt of the ordinance of God, refuſe or deſpiſe the gr ace of God offered in baptiſm. Therefore they are to be admitted to that whereof they are apparently & undeniably capable; w^ch is the external ſeal at leaſt: which is all that man for preſent can adminiſter, or we will contend for; being moſt willing to leave ſecret things to God, and to hope the beſt, where the contrary cannot appear unto us: only add hereto, if the iſſue be put upon the capacitie or incapacitie of the Infant, with relation to any condition ſo much inſiſted on, let any of our *Antagoniſts* ſhew us how or wherin Infants under the Goſpel & covenant of grace in Chriſt, have leſs capacity in reſpect thereof then Infants under the Law of *Moſes* had, or that baptiſm is not the ſeal of the ſame righteouſneſs of faith in Chriſt, wherof circumciſion for the time was the ſeal.

Rom. 4.

4 That w^ch without any expreſſed exception to particulars Chriſts commiſſion holds forth to *all nations*, belongs to Infants as well as perſons of years; for Infants are alwayes a great part of *all nations*: but Chriſts commiſſion holds forth baptiſm to *all nations* without any expreſſed exception to particulars: therefore baptiſm belongs to Infants (of believing Parents) as well as to perſons of years

Matth. 28 19. *Mark* 16. 16.

5 No man may forbid water, that is, the outward adminiſtration, where God hath given the inward operation of his H. Spirit (which *maxim* the Apoſtle built on, in that then--difficult queſtion, whether the *Gentiles* might be ſealed into the covenant of grace.) But God hath given the inward operation of his H. Spirit to Infants. *Ier.* 1. 5. *Luk.* 1. 15. 1 *Cor.* 7. 14 therefore no man may forbid water, or the outward adminiſtration for the baptiſm of Infants. The reaſon of the *major* is that all they who are partakers of the grace both ſignified & exhibited in baptiſm, have right to the ſign and ſacrament thereof, and therefore may not be barred from it; for that were to withſtand God, *Act.* 11. 17. In reaſon where God hath beſtowed the grace ſignified, man may not deny the ſignifying element; and in common right, the apparent heirs are unjuſtly denied the deeds and evidences whereby that right is aſſured upon them: for theſe are a part of their inheritance, and ought by right to follow the ſame: moreover

Act. 10. 47. *See Act.* 10. 1, 14. 15, 20. *Act.* 11. 3, 15, 17.

'tis

'tis impious to divide that w^ch God hath join'd, the ſign from the thing ſignified; as they do, who allow children, grace, remiſſion of ſins and ſalvation by Chriſt, and yet deny them baptiſm into Chriſt; they will yeild them the Jewels, but not the Cabinet, the Treaſure, but not the Purſe.

6 All that are capable of the initiatorie ſeal of future faith, ought to be baptized: but Infants are capable thereof, therfore they ought to be baptized. So under the law Infants were capable of circumciſion, the ſeal of their future faith: & our Infants have no leſs capacitie thereof then they had.

7 All they to whom Gods covenant of Grace extends, are to receive the initiatory ſeal thereof (for ſealing of the covenant reſpectively, is a part thereof, *Gen.*17.10,11. *Mark.* 16.16.) but Gods covenant of Grace in Chriſt extends to Infants of covenanted perſons: therefore Infants ought to receive the initiatory ſeal of the covenant, which is baptiſm. The aſſumption is proved from *Act.*2.38,39. *Be baptized every one of you— for the remiſſion of ſins--for the promiſe is unto you, and to your children.* What promiſe? that upon which the Covenant was ſealed to *Abraham* and his ſeed, the faithful: and when, where, or how have Infants of Chriſtians forfeited their right to the ſeal, who as ſuch, cannot forfeit?

8 If circumciſion and baptiſm were for ſubſtance, both reſpective ſeals of the ſame covenant of God in Chriſt, then thoſe ſorts of men who were capable of the one, are capable of the other: but circumciſion and baptiſm were for ſubſtance both reſpective ſeals of the ſame covenant of God in Chriſt, therefore thoſe ſorts of men (to wit, Infants as well as perſons of years) who were capable of circumciſion, are capable of baptiſm. The *major* may appear in that God never made any covenant of grace but only in Chriſt, and the ſame Goſpel was preached to *Abraham*, and he believed in the ſame Chriſt, *Gal.*3.8. add hereto, there is the ſame efficient primary cauſe, to wit, God making a covenant with his, and appointing the reſpective ſeals thereof: the ſame neceſſity on the receivers part, original ſin in Infants, who have therefore as much need of regeneration and admiſſion into the covenant of God for remedy, as they had under

the law, and there is the ſame power and efficacie of the holy Ghoſt ſtill remaining; otherwiſe Gods grace in the New Teſtament, and covenant in Chriſt exhibited, ſhould be more reſtrained, and of leſs latitude, then it was in the Old, under that ſevere Schoolmaſter *the Law*; and, which were impious to affirm, then Chriſts coming into the world ſhould be ſo much diſvantageous to believers, as that the Goſpel ſhould take away the ſeal of Gods covenant of grace from our children, which the Law allowed them under the ſeverity therof.

No part or condition of the covenant by God appointed for remiſſion of ſins and ſalvation, may be withheld by man from thoſe who have right to the covenant and promiſe of God, under ſevere puniſhment: but the initiatory Sacrament, Baptiſm, now is a part or condition of the covenant by God appointed for remiſſion of ſins and ſalvation, whereto Infants have right: therefore it may not be withheld from ſuch Infants as are within the covenant, and have right thereto and to the promiſe of God, See *Exod.* 4. *Luk.* 3.3. *Act.* 2.38, 39. *Tit.* 3.5. now the initiatorie ſeal of the covenant was, and is a part or condition of the ſame, *Gen.* 17.10,11. *Mark.* 16.16. *Joh.* 3.5.

10 All they whom God accounteth holy, have a capacity of baptiſm the ſeal thereof: but God accounteth children of believing parents holy, 1 *Cor.* 7.14. Therefore children of believing parents have a capacitie of baptiſm; nor doth that ridiculous interpretation which Anabaptiſts have borrowed of the Jeſuites concerning *legitimacie*, overthrow this argument.

See Andr. Riv. Cath. Orthod. to. 2. q. 3. tract. 3. p. 32, 38, 39.

11 All thoſe who being redeemed by Chriſt, have right to the kingdom of heaven, have right to the ordinary *Port* and *Inlet* into the ſame, that is baptiſm: but children of believers have right to the kingdom of heaven, *Mark.* 10.14. *Mat.* 19. 13. therefore children of believers have right to baptiſm. Chriſt expreſſeth the entrance or means to regeneration and the kingdom of heaven *Joh.* 3.5. to wit, water of baptiſm, by which the H. Ghoſt doth ordinarily work thereto; and preſently gives the reaſon--*that which is born of the fleſh is fleſh*: that, as ſuch, cannot enter into the kingdom of God. 1 *Cor.*

15.

15. 50. now Infants are from their natural birth, but fleſh and blood, *Pſ.* 51.7. *Eph.* 2.3. therefore if they muſt enter into the kingdom of God, they muſt be born again of water and the H. Ghoſt: it is true, that God can and doth regenerate many Infants without baptiſm by his H. Spirit, ſo that they dying without the Sacrament, are yet ſaved in an extraordinary way: but for us to deny them baptiſm, and to put their ſalvation upon extraordinary means, where God hath appointed and declared the ordinary, is as much as man can do to ſhut them from the kingdom of heaven; and ſo though their want of baptiſm ſhall not be their eternal loſs whom God hath elected, yet is it their great ſin who neglect or deſpiſe the ordinance of God, and thereby (except in caſe of repentance) they ſhall exclude themſelves.

12 Whatſoever Chriſt commanded Miniſters to do, and which the Apoſtles in the ordinary office of Miniſters did do, that is right and juſt to be done, and we ought to do: but Chriſt commanded Miniſters to baptize *all nations* without exception of children; and that the *Apoſtles* did do (for above all contradiction they obeyed Chriſt therein) therefore it is right and juſt to baptize Infants, as being a great part of *all nations*, and we ought to do it.

13 That which agreeth with the nature of the ſeal of the righteouſneſs of faith and the inſtitution of Chriſt, ought to be done: but Infant-baptiſm agreeth with theſe; therefore it ought to be done: it agreeth with the inſtitution of Chriſt, who commanding to baptize *all nations*, well knew that there were many Infants therein, yet makes no exception of them, but gives them ſo high an *eulogium*, that we may know that the initiatory ſeal belongeth principally to them, as it did under the Law: what though God name not Infants to be baptized, in ſo many words and ſyllables? yet ſeeing he neither nameth men of years nor women, it muſt needs be that under theſe words *all nations*, he comprehended all thoſe of which, *nations*, as their *integrant* parts, conſiſt; which are men, women and children: it agreeth alſo with the nature of the ſeal, which is the initiatorie Sacrament of regeneration, implantation into Chriſt, faith, mortification, putting off the old

man, putting on Chriſt, remiſſion of ſins, deliverance from the wrath of God and curſe of the Law; all which is as neceſſary for Infants that they may be ſaved, as for any others, and into theſe either for preſent or future they are baptized.

14 God ever ſince his covenant made with *Abraham*, appointed Infants ſome ſeal of his covenant as well with them as their parents, whereof they were ſome ways capable, and whereby they might be externally known not only to God (that they are long before any man can ſeal them, 2*Tim.* 2.19. *Tit.* 1.2. *Rom.* 8.29. & 9.11.) but alſo of men (or otherwiſe he muſt have caſt out Infants under the Goſpel from right to the ſeal of his covenant which he gave them under the Law) to be within Gods covenant; therefore God hath appointed baptiſm to Infants: add hereto, that whereas poor Infants need mercie for remiſſion of original ſin; they are not for preſent capable of the other ordinary means appointed perſons of years, as hearing the Word, receiving the Lords Supper, prayer, repentance, &c. they are paſsively capable of baptiſm, as under the law they were of circumciſion; therefore ſeeing remiſsion of ſin is ſimply neceſſary; baptiſm, the ordinary means thereto, is neceſſary, if it may be had.

15 Whatſoever Infants of believers are capable of, as intereſted in Gods covenant, without the help of preſent underſtanding, that man ought not to bar them of: but ſuch Infants as intereſted in Gods covenant, are capable of baptiſm without the preſent help of underſtanding: therefore they ought not to be bar'd thereof by man. The *major* appeareth in Infants circumciſion on the eighth day; that was the ſeal of the ſame faith and covenant of God in Chriſt, and a part or condition of the ſame, as baptiſm now is, as hath been proved. The *minor* appears *Gen.* 17.7. *I will eſtabliſh my covenant between me and thee, and thy ſeed after thee, &c.* that is, with thy Infants alſo as well as with thee: and by vertue hereof *Iſaac* at eight dayes old received the ſeal of the righteouſneſs of faith without the help of preſent underſtanding: and there is the ſame reaſon of baptiſm in reſpect of Gods promiſe, *Act.* 2. 39. and the alteration of the ſeal altereth not the covenant in ſubſtance, ſubject or end. I ſuppoſe all know that children of

Gen. 17. 10, 11. Mark. 16. 16. Joh. 3. 5.

Chriſtians

Chriſtians without the help of preſent underſtanding, are now as capable of Baptiſm the more eaſie ſeal, as they were of Circumciſion the more painful and bloody: And leſt any ſhould think that this Priviledge of Infants-ſealing, belonged only to *Abrahams* Carnal-ſeed the *Jews*, the Holy Ghoſt teſtifieth that they which are of the Faith, *the ſame are the children of Abraham*, Gal. 3.7. and again, *The Promiſe is to you, and to your children, and to all that are a far off, even as many as the Lord our God ſhall call:* Now he hath called us *Gentiles* to the faith in Chriſt, who were once a far off: Therefore Infants of thoſe who by Calling are intereſſed in Gods Covenant, are capable of Baptiſm: Moreover, as hath been noted, as the worldly wiſe men (by the creatures, *Rom.* 1.21.) knew God, but loved him not (by grace dwelling in them) neither glorified him as God. So theſe (Infants) may have him, before they can know him; that is, they may be regenerate by the holy Spirit before they have the uſe of underſtanding, that they may know the things which are given them of God; and certainly all Elect Infants, though dying yong, are regenerate, (elſe could they not be ſaved) yet ſo young they can have no actual knowledge of their regeneration, or means thereunto belonging; and if they are ſaved, and have the inward Seal of Gods Spirit, how injuriouſly are they barred from the external ſeal by man? To conclude, Infants are interreſſed by Gods promiſe, which dependeth not on any mans underſtanding, ſanctity or excellency, but on the free grace of God, who made this Covenant with us when we were all in the courſe of corrupted nature, *enemies, without Chriſt, aliens, ſtrangers from the Covenants of Promiſe, having no hope, and without God in the world*, Epheſ. 2. 12. Laſtly, as by one mans diſobedience *many were made ſinners*, and ſo ſin is communicated to all mankinde, yea, to thoſe who have not yet the uſe of reaſon; for we ſee that Infants dye as well as old men: So by one, *Chriſts Righteouſneſs* imputed, many are made righteous in Baptiſm the Laver of Regeneration, though they yet underſtand it not: So put they on Chriſt, though it be not yet

Acts 2 39.

Quem potuerunt illi noſſe nec habere, iſti potuerunt habere antequam noſſe. Aug Ep. 57.

Acts 2.39.

Rom. 5.10.

Cor.2.12. yet given them to *know the things which are given them of God.* See *Argument* 2.

16. The command for baptizing is for all that are to be ſaved · But among thoſe are many Infants; therefore the command for baptizing is for Infants alſo, or without excluſion of all Infants.

Matth. 28. 19. Mark 16. 16.

17. That opinion which makes the Covenant or Priviledge of the Goſpel worſe to *Abrahams* ſpiritual ſeed, then it was to his carnal, is falſe and erroneous, yea *Antichriſtian*: But to deny Believers Infants baptiſm, (the initiatory Seal of the Covenant, and the priviledge thereof) makes this worſe then that; Therefore it is falſe &c. The *major* is confirmed in that God avoweth the Goſpel to be *a better* Covenant then that of the Law, *Heb.* 8.6. The *minor* likewiſe, becauſe under the Law, Infants had the priviledge of the initiatory ſeal. The Goſpel-Covenant holdeth forth an enlargement of the ſigns and ſubject of Gods mercy: It was before only to the Jews generally, who had the Ordinances of Righteouſneſs, as *Gideons Fleece* the dew, while all the floor (which then figured the *Gentiles*) was dry: But now Chriſt ſaith, *Go Teach all nations, baptizing them* —— So far was it from diminiſhing, or contracting the grace of God by the coming of Chriſt like rain into the Fleece, that now he ſent it to all Nations, who before gave it only to one. And the Covenant of God made with *Abraham*, was teſtified by an external Seal, to comfort Parents in aſſurance that God had care for, and a Covenant with their children alſo. Now they that take this away from children under the Goſpel, make the Goſpel-Covenant much worſe, as being leſs teſtified then that under the Law. Add hereto, that the coming of Chriſt (which ſet an end to Legal ceremonies, and appointed Baptiſm) diminiſhed not the grace of his Father in the Signs and Diſpenſations thereof, making it more dark, or leſs teſtified by a Seal towards thoſe who are within the *Covenant* of Grace; but rather encreaſed or communicated it more clearly, and therein it is a better Covenant, *Hebr.* 8. 6. not in reſpect of God the appointer thereof,

Pſal.47. 2.

of, he is one and the ſame for ever; not in reſpect of *Chriſt the Mediator*, he is the ſame under the Law and Goſpel; but in reſpect of the exhibition of things promiſed and ſhadowed out in the Law, and clearer manifeſtation of Gods grace and truth in Chriſt. Now they who deny Infants of believers the initiatory ſeal of Gods Covenant, as much as in them lieth, diminiſh the grace of God; and make the Covenant ſeem worſe by Chriſts coming, in that they diminiſh the comfortable aſſurance of our childrens implantation into Chriſt, and of his care of, and favour to them, if they may not ſo much as be marked with the external ſign and ſeal thereof, which yet elect and reprobates, if of years, may by your leave, and do receive.

18. That which is evil to be done, is forbidden in ſome expreſs and known Law and Word of God: But Infant-baptiſm is forbidden in no expreſs and known Law and word of God; therefore it is not evil, as our Antagoniſts would make the world believe.

19. That whereof God will ſeverely puniſh the contempt or neglect, we muſt not omit: But God will ſeverely puniſh the contempt or neglect of his Covenant of grace and mercy, whereof Baptiſm is a part or condition, as well with Infants as perſons of years; therefore we may not omit it. See *Gen.*17.14. *Exod.*4. *Mark* 16.16 *Hebr.* 10.28,29. and that being ſuppoſed (which hath hitherto been proved) that Infants of Church-priviledged Parents, ought to be baptized, the Miniſter who upon ſuch fancies and unſufficient grounds as are alledged by our *Antagoniſts*, refuſeth to baptize them (or the Parent who will not have them baptized) muſt needs be under a woful condition; the Apoſtles argument being good from the diſpenſation of the Goſpel committed to him to the neceſſary adminiſtration of the ſame, as in preaching the word, ſo in the ſeals thereto belonging, whereof he expreſly ſaith, 1 *Cor.*9. 16. *Wo is unto me, if I preach not the Goſpel*: For though his principal and firſt office was to preach, as being appointed the *Doctor of the Gentiles*, firſt to be taught, and then reſpectively to be baptized, yet

it

it is manifeſt that the Diſpenſation of Baptiſm, the ſeal of the Goſpel, and Covenant of God in Chriſt, went along in charge with preaching of the ſame, and was committed to the Apoſtles, and all *Miniſters* their Succeſſors, and *ſo woe* will be to them if they baptize not (where Chriſt intended the ſeal of his Grace) as ſurely as if they preach not the Goſpel.

Matth. 28. 19, 20.

20. They are to be held *as Heathens and Publicans*, who refuſe to hear and obey the *Church of Chriſt*: But ſuch are *Anabaptiſts*; nor is it any excuſe, but an aggravation of their ſin to beſpatter the *Church* with impious calumnies: It had been and ever was, as eaſie for all ſorts of hereticks in and ſince Chriſt and the Apoſtles time, and in the pureſt ages of the primitive Church, to have ſaid for a pretended defence of their errour and contumacy, you are not the true *Church*; but in ſpight of *Satan* and the *powers of hel*, we are through the mercy of God, a member of the true Church of Chriſt, & therefore their ſchiſm & contempt is the more condemnable.

21. Thoſe to whom the things ſignified belong, unto them belong alſo the ſigns and ſeals thereof, except in caſe of ſome apparent condition making an evident exception (as want of ability to examine themſelves, barreth Infants from the holy Euchariſt) But the thing ſignified by Baptiſm belongs to Infants, and there is no apparent condition making any evident exception to bar them from it; therefore Baptiſm belongeth to them. The things ſignified by Baptiſm, are, that we are thereby received into Gods favour, for the blood of Chriſt ſhed for us, to binde us to a ſincere obedience to faith, and endeavour to newneſs of life; Gods promiſe of grace and mercy in Chriſt, marking us for ſheep of his paſture; our puting on Chriſt, regeneration, waſhing from our ſins, juſtification & ſalvation by Chriſt; theſe things belong to all the elect, whereof Infants of Believers are a very conſiderable part: And theſe things are held forth in Baptiſm as things ſignified in the ſign by God appointed to all receivers ſacramentally, and to an external communion, of which lambs aſwel as ſheep, Infants aſwel as the aged are capable: Therefore Baptiſm belongeth to Infants of *Chriſtian* Parents.

22. To

22. To whom the Covenant in force runneth in the ſame tenour in the new Teſtament as in the old, to ſuch perſons the application of the *Initiatory ſeal* of the new Teſtament ought to be adminiſtred, as well as was the *Initiatory ſeal* of the old: But the Covenant in force runs in the ſame tenour, &c. therefore the *Initiatory ſeal* of the Covenant ought now to be adminiſtred to ſuch perſons as the *Initiatory ſeal* of the Covenant was adminiſtred to in the old: The tenor of the Covenant was to Parents and their children upon condition that they ſhould be ſealed according to the promiſe, that *God* would be their God, who would obſerve the Laws and conditions thereof: the ſame is ſtill for ſubſtance in force, though the ſeals are changed: So that as Infants were circumciſed, ſo ought they now to be baptized: and except this be allowed to our Infants as well as to our ſelves believing in Chriſt, we are not (as the Apoſtle affirms, *Col.* 2.10.) *Compleat in him--In whom we are circumciſed with the Circumciſion made without hands---Buried with him in Baptiſm, &c.* Nor are we and our children ſo ſealed into our implantation into the death of Chriſt, that we may (in the ordinary way) thereby be aſſured, that as he put off the infirm affections of the natural body, ſo we put off the body of ſin ſpiritually. See *Rom.* 6.3, *&c.* *N. Homes pag. 9.*

23. Such perſons as were typically baptized unto *Moſes*, are capable of the real and true baptiſm under the Goſpel of Chriſt: For in the main the argument holds from the type to the truth, though poſſibly not in every circumſtance: But children as well as perſons of years were baptized *in the cloud, and in the red-ſea unto Moſes*, 1 *Cor.* 10. 2. and their waſhing with rain from the cloud, prefigur'd our waſhing in Baptiſm, and by the Spirit; therefore children of covenanted perſons are capable of the true and real Baptiſm under the Goſpel of Chriſt. *Dr. Featly child-bapt. juſtified, pag. 45. 46.*

24. Where there is a command for a thing never remanded or countermanded, there that thing is ſtill in force: But there is a command for the ſigning of Infants of Believers with the ſign of Gods Covenant with their Parents and them, never yet remanded or countermanded; Therefore *Hen Ainſworth to the Anabapt. Gen. 17. 7, 9.*

the ſigning of Believers children with the ſign of Gods Covenant, which is Baptiſm, is ſtill in force.

24. That which dependeth not on any age, or act of man, but on the meer inſtitution and gracious promiſe of God, as its ground, may not be denyed by man to any comprehended under the general term of *All Nations*, in reſpect of any age, or defects thereof, as want of underſtanding, and the acts thereof in faith, repentance, &c. in Infants: But Baptiſm depended not on any age or act of man as its ground, but on the meer inſtitution and gracious promiſe of God; therefore it ought not by anyman be denied infants, in reſpect of their preſent defect or want of underſtanding, or the acts thereof in faith, repentance, &c. they being comprehended in *All Nations*.

The *minor* appears in S. *Peters* anſwer to his hearers prickt in heart, *Repent and be baptized every one of you for the remiſſion of ſins*; Gen 17.7. **For the Promiſe** *is unto you and unto your children, &c.* He ſaith not, Be baptized, for ye have repented, ye are of age, and a good underſtanding; but, Be baptized, &c. *for the* **Promiſe** *is to you and to your children*; though they cannot yet actually believe, repent, underſtand, &c. yet they have Gods promiſe for the ground of their ſealing, on whoſe grace and ordinance the whole power and vertue of the ſacrament dependeth: But his grace and Ordinance depend not on any excellency, ability or act of man; therefore the Apoſtle fetched not the reaſon of his Exhortation from their age or repentance, but from the promiſe and mercy of God calling them who were far of.

Deus ut perſonam non accipit, ſic nec ætatem, Cypri. ad Fid. Ep. 59.

Baſting. de bap. infant.

26. For concluſion, I take up this *congeriem* of arguments out of the learned *Urſinus*. That opinion is pernicious which robs poor Infants of their right, which obſcureth the grace and mercy of God (who would that Infants of Believers ſhould from the womb be reckoned members of his Church) which derogates from the grace offered in the new Covenant, making it leſs then that in the old; which weakneth the comfort of the Church and faithful Parents; which denyeth Infants that ſeal which ſhould differ them from the children of *Jews and Pagans*; which contradicteth the Apoſtles rea-

ſon

ſon(*Can any man forbid water, that theſe ſhould not be baptiptized, which have received the holy Ghoſt aſwell as we?*)which keepeth Infants(as much as man can)fromChriſt;he expreſly ſaying, *Suffer little children to come unto me*, which without a Covenant they cannot do ſpiritually, nor without the external ſeal,ſacramentally: Now ſuch is the opinion of *Anabaptiſts*, denying *Chriſtians* Infants Baptiſm.

CHAP. IV.

Anabaptiſts Arguments concerning the neceſſity of Dipping over head and ears in Baptiſm, examined and anſwered.

THe envious *Philiſtims* will ſtill be caſting earth into *Iſaacs* wells of livings waters, to ſtop them up: *Satan* envying man,theſe waters of life in the *Laver of Regeneration*, eſtſoon caſteth in ſcruples to obſtruct and make void the holy ordinances of God to deluded ſouls,by cauſing them to renounce their Baptiſm(and Chriſt whom they ſacramentally had put on therein) by taking on them another Baptiſm under a vain pretence, that they were not ſuſceptive of Baptiſm in their infancy,nor lawfully baptized,neither at all truly,if happily they were not dipped under water;for they ſay, the inſtitution of *Chriſt* requireth that the whole man be *dipped* all over in water: ſo that the *Anabaptiſts* now hold,that dipping the whole body into water is eſſential to baptiſm,& ſo neceſſary, that except they are ſo dipt, they are not duly and truly baptized according to the inſtitution of *Chriſt*. Since the infancy of the Goſpel, *Satan* hath not ceaſed to trouble the Church concerning baptiſm: Some of the Jews would have circumciſion joyned with baptiſm; the *Archontici* condemned baptiſm with a curſe:the *Novatians* deferred it to the laſt,becauſe they underſtood not the power of this ordinance of God to cleanſe the whole life,but thought that there was no mercy for him who ſinned after baptiſm: *Liberius* the Monk, as alſo *Fidus*, would have childrens Baptiſm tyed to the eighth day; *Anabaptiſts* not only deny believers children

Genes.26.15.

A. R. van. of child.bap p 8.

Acts 15.1. ἀναθεματίζειν ὅτε τὸ λαϐεῖν, &c.

Epiphan. hæreſ. 40.n.1. Archon. μετὰ δὲ τὸ λαϐεῖν μηκέτι δύνασθαι ἐλεεῖσθαι φησὶ πεπωκότα.

ib. Epiphan.Chari. hæreſ.39.n.1.

Cyprian.Ep 59.

children Baptiſm, as the *Pelagians* and *Donatiſts* did of old; but affirm, That dipping the whole body under water is ſo neceſſary, that without it, none are truly baptized (as hath been ſaid) So the ſubtil enemy ſtill aſſaileth Baptiſm in one part or another, that we may not unaptly apply that to him & his factors, which *Tertullian* once ſaid concerning the moſt impious Perſecutor *Nero*, *He that knows him well, may underſtand, that nothing but ſome great* (or ſingular) *good thing is condemned by Nero:* And indeed we ought more highly to eſteem Gods favor in ſealing us into his Covenant of grace, and more ſeriouſly and carefully endeavour to anſwer thereto in newneſs and ſanctity of living, by how much more the enemy rageth againſt it. The *Proteſtant Church* holdeth, that the *word* and the *element* make the Sacrament; and that neither ſprinkling is ſimply neceſſary, nor waſhing or dipping unlawful; but that according to the convenience of times, places and perſons, either ſprinkling, waſhing or dipping in the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghoſt, is the true form of Baptiſm; and that, *cæteris paribus*, either of theſe three applications of the water have the ſame effect, and may as convenience ſerves, indifferently be uſed, being fit to ſignifie the application of the benefit of *Chriſts* blood for the remiſſion of ſin, and cleanſing therefrom. But our *Antagoniſts* ſay;

Qui enim ſcitillum, intelligere poteſt, non niſi grande aliquod bonum à Nerone damnatum. Tertul. Apol. c. 25.

Object. 1. *We are buried with Chriſt by baptiſm into his death, that like as Chriſt was raiſed up from the dead, even ſo we alſo ſhould walk in newneſs of life*, Rom. 6.4. *But Chriſt in his burial was covered, that he might thence riſe out of the earth; therefore in Baptiſm we muſt be covered, and as it were buried under water, that we may riſe again as Chriſt did.*

We anſwer, 1. *Similitudes* run not on four feet; types, ſigns and ſimilitudes are not to be extended beyond the ſcope and meaning of the Speaker (as might be ſhewed in almoſt innumerable inſtances) leſt not only abſurdities, but horrid blaſphemies ſhould be thence inferred. The Ark in the Deluge

Scire autem? oportet quod non undiquaq; exempla ad omne propoſitum aptantur rebus ad quas aſſumuntur, ſed ut plurimum in magis propriis ac principalioribus partibus. Euthym. in Matth. 22. Non oportet parabolas ad verbum interpretari. ib. in Matth. 24. poſt Chryſoſtom. Parabolica ita tractanda ſunt quaſi ſignificantia ſolum ea quæ neceſſaria ſunt. Euthym. in Matth. 24.

was

was a type of Baptiſm, 1 Pet.3 20,21. what, muſt the type and truth agree in all things? muſt all the world be drown'd, and only eight perſons ſaved? I doubt you would hardly agree among your ſelves, which ſhould be the eight. The red-ſea and cloud, figured baptiſm, 1 *Cor.*10.1, &c. what, would you have your diſciples baptized with the ſprie of two neighboring ſeas, and a cloud of freſh water raining on their heads? *Jonah's* being in the Whales belly, was a type of Chriſts burial and reſurrection; you would not have your diſciples in their conformity, be three days under water. Theſe inſtances may ſhew the vanity of ſtretching types and ſigns to every fancy of *Hectic braines*; and now deal ingenuouſly, what reaſon or warrant have you to wreſt this ſimilitude to what you pleaſe? in thoſe *ſimiles* which are moſt apt, there may be many diſconveniences found: Or what commiſſion can you dream of, that gives you authority to draw this alledged Scripture beyond the *Apoſtles* ſcope and purpoſe, rather to that which ſeems to favour your fancy and practiſe of immerſion, then to another ſenſe?

2. Thoſe expreſſions, *Rom.*6.4. are meerly figurative, and therefore do not at all bind us to any external, or literal ſenſe or obſervance in the maner of baptizing; & if the ſimilitude muſt fully hold, ſome might poſſibly reaſon thus; as Chriſt was firſt dead and buried, and roſe again the third day, ſo we muſt firſt be dead and buried, and then be baptized, and riſe with Chriſt a third time (*Marcion*, that old pernicious heretick, held, that one might be three times baptized) or they might infer that we muſt not riſe up out of the water into which we are dipt, until the third day: but how abſurd ſuch inferences are, none can be ignorant.

3. The alledged ſcripture concludes not the manner of our baptiſm, but the effects thereof; not how the water ſhould be applied, or in what maner we ſhonld be baptized, whether by ſprinkling, waſhing or dipping; but how we ought to live who are baptized; that ſin ſhould henceforth have no more power over us, then if we were dead; that we ſhould ſo live to righteouſneſs, and bringing forth fruits thereof, as being implanted into Chriſt, and ſo no more living our own life, but the holy life of Chriſt.

4. He

4. He saith not, We are buried with Christ in water, or just as Christ was buried in his baptism; but, *into the likeness of his death*; that like as Christ was raised up from the dead, so we should (not be raised out of the water, but) *walk in newness of life*: Here is the main substance of the similitude; 'tis not in any circumstance. Now I would fain know whether a man may not *walk in newness of life*, being baptized with sprinkling, as well as if he had been doused.

5. The argument here drawn to prove necessity of immersion is a *fallicia accidentis*; a reasoning from the the substance to the accident. Suppose thus, *We must be baptized into the similitude of Christs death: But he was covered and rose again*; ergo, *We must be covered with water that we may be raised again, &c. Non sequitur*: his being covered in the rocky vault, was but a circumstance, as was his lying covered to the third day: therefore it can be no more here concluded, that we must be like Christ in being covered with water in baptism, then that we must lie under water three days and nights in our baptism, because he lay so long in his grave; for why should one circumstance or accident be concluded, rather then another?

6. If the similitude must be so strictly urged, it will be rather for us. *Christ* was not thrown down, prone, with his face downward (as they use to dive their disciples) but honorably embalmed, and decently laid in a new Sepulchre; and we use solemnly to bury our dead with their faces upward, & sprinkle dust and earth upon them; and in such decent posture we baptize Infants, by putting our sprinkling water on them, or by dipping them.

7. *Christs natural body was truly dead & buried, we must therefore understand that which must be done in us by analogy and proportion, and not wrest the *Apostles* words to a litteral sense: The body of sin is then buried, when the power thereof is enervated and weakned, and as it were a dead carcase, is so over-whelmed and buried, that it can no more move and force a man whither it would, and was wont: and this is said to be done in Baptism in a twofold respect, 1. In respect of Christ, into whom when we are implanted by baptism, all the benefits of his death are freely given and sealed to

*Corpus Christi naturale fuit verè sepultum; an putandum est nostra corpora eodem modo sepeliri in administratine baptismi? non id vult Apostolus; sed ut rectè. Chrys. observavit in 6. ad Rom quod in Christo factum est per naturam, id in nobis fieri intelligit per analogiam & proportionem: corpus igitur peccati sepelitur quando ejus vis enervatur...obruitur & quasi cadaver terra obrutum, non possit amplius movere, & quoquo velit hominem impellere, &c. Davn. in Col. 2. 12.

to us; ſo that our ſins are buried in his grave, who bare our *ſins in his own body*, 1 Pet. 2.24. ſo in his burial our ſins were covered, no more to appear in judgment againſt us, or to be imputed to us. 2. In reſpect of our mortification, ſacramentally accompliſhed in our baptiſm, and by the Spirit of God by certain degrees in al our life long; though bodily death, being a privation of life, hath no degrees: he that is dead dyeth no more; yet in our ſpiritual death to ſin, there are degrees, & we dye daily, as the power of ſin is more and more broken in us.

That baptiſm which is not agreeable to Chriſts or Johns baptiſm, is not inſtituted by Chriſt (& therefore mans invention, and will-worſhip) But waſhing or ſprinkling with water agreeth not with the baptiſm of Chriſt or John *(for they baptized and were baptized in* Jordan; *and the Eunuch was baptized in the brook*, Acts 8.38.) *therefore baptizing with ſprinkling, or only waſhing, is not inſtituted by Chriſt.* Object. 2.

We anſwer, 1. This is a fallacious arguing, the term (*agreeable*) being *homonymical*: 'tis doubtful in the aſſumption, whether he mean *agreeable* in ſubſtance, or in circumſtance: that which is not *agreeable* in ſubſtance with the baptiſm of Chriſt and *John Baptiſt*, is not inſtituted by Chriſt; but this holds not in point of circumſtance; for then there could be no lawful baptiſm but in *Jordan*, or ſome other water of *Paleſtine*.

2. It follows not that *John B.* dived Chriſt or any other into water; or *Philip* the *Eunuch*, becauſe *John* baptized in *Jordan* (where were ſome ſandy places) becauſe we read, they went down into the water; for ſo they may do, who only wet their feet, or go up to their knees or anckles: & we muſt conſider, that in the infancy of the Goſpel, they had not publike *Oratories* and *Fonts* to accommodate them baptizing, as in a ſetled ſtate of the *Church* we have ſeen; and therefore they baptized where they could have convenience of water, which in that dry region was not every where to be had; as appeareth in that reaſon of *Johns* baptizing in *Ænon* near *Salim*, given by the Evangeliſt—*becauſe there was much water there*. John 3.23.

3. It is not probable that Chriſt was dipt cloathes and all in *Jordan*, and ſo went immediately wringing-wet into the wilderneſs: ſee *Mark* 1.1,2,10. nor that he was ſtripped naked with

with ſuch a confuſed multitude of men and women as came to *Johns* baptiſm: ſee *Luke* 3. 21. *Matth.* 21. 31,32. *Matth.* 3.5,6.

4. It is but a weak Fallacy to diſpute *à particulari, ad generale*; thus, *ſome went into the river to be baptized; therefore all that are to be baptized ought ſo to do:* for in things circumſtantial, and without ſome binding Precept to impoſe them as duties, a particular example can beget no general rule for our due and neceſſary imitation.

5. If it could be proved (which all our *Antagoniſts* can never do) that Chriſt and thoſe whom *John* baptized, were duckt into the water when they were baptized, yet it doth no more follow thence, that all muſt everywhere, and at all ſeaſons be ſo baptized, then that the Lords Supper may be adminiſtred with none but unleavened bread, in an upper room after Supper, to twelve men only, no women; becauſe Chriſt ſo adminiſtred it; or that we muſt anoint the ſick with oyl, or ſalute with an holy kiſs, becauſe theſe things were in uſe in thoſe Regions; nay, but matters circumſtantial are ever liable to the *teſt* of accommodation and cuſtoms of times and places, and perſons: dipping might be convenient in thoſe hot Regions, and at *Eaſter* and *Pentecoſt*, to which their baptizing was limited of old, which in theſe *Northern* climats, and in the dead of winter, were near deathful to tender bodies.

Baptiſma olim non niſi in Paſcha & Pentecoſte collatum, &c. vid. Concil. Conſtantinop. 2 c. 1. n. 2. Greg. Nazianz. ora. 40 Tertul. de bapt. c. 19, &c.

6. *Chriſts* baptiſm is waſhing, *Epheſ.* 5.25,26. and waſhing is as well by ſprinkling, or pouring on of water, as by *dipping* into water: hence the Apoſtle ſpeaking of the *waſhing of Regeneration*, preſently ſaith, οὗ ἐξέχεεν ἐφ' ἡμᾶς, *which he hath poured out on us*; and the Scripture calleth the divers ſprinklings mentioned, *Heb.* 9.13,19,21. βαπτισμοὺς, *baptiſmes*, *v.* 10. As waſhings or ſprinklings are alſo called, *Mark* 7. 4. but hereof we ſhall ſee more anon; for the preſent only note, that the Holy Ghoſt, the ſureſt Interpreter of Scripture, interpreteth *Baptizing* by ſprinkling or waſhing, ſo that there is no neceſſity (as our *Antagoniſts* would fain have it) of dipping or douſing the whole body under water.

χέω, fundo, effundo, interp. Suid. reddit fundo, &c. χέω fundo, &c. χέομαι—Ibamina manibus fundo. Budæus. Syr. הוּ דְאַשַׁר *..quem effudit ſuper nos. Tran.* *el. Beza, &c. à verbo Siro* אשׁר *effudit. Shindler, in Rom.* 3.15. *Matth* 9. 17. & 23.35.

Dipping (ſay they) *is baptizing, and baptizing dipping: Chriſt therefore who inſtituted Baptiſm, therein appointed that the whole man ſhould be dipped in Baptiſm.* Object. 3.

We anſwer: 1. If this bubble had any weight or ſolidity, it were eaſily retorted; waſhing or ſprinkling is baptizing (in Goſpel-ſenſe) Chriſt therefore who inſtituted Baptiſm, therein appointed men to be waſhed or ſprinkled with water.

2. Prove that Chriſt appointed the *whole man* ſhould be dipped all over in water, by ſome other *medium* if you can: by this you cannot; true it is, that all dipping all over in water is baptizing, but not convertibly; for all baptizing is not dipping: for it is proved by the fore-alledged Scriptures, that waſhing by pouring on, or ſprinkling water, is alſo a kinde of baptizing: If you ſhould ſay, every man is a living creature, that is true, but not convertible, therefore every living creature is a man: it follows not; becauſe there are more ſpecies of living creatures then one; all dipping is baptizing; therefore all baptizing is dipping, follows not, becauſe there are more ſorts of baptizings then one by dipping. Βαπτίζω ſometimes ſignifieth to dip, but not always: The Apoſtles according to Chriſts promiſe, were baptized with fire; they were not (after the fooliſh *Jacobites* opinion) dipt into fire, the cloven tongues *ſate upon each of them*? The Phariſees among many other traditions, uſed the baptiſm of beds, *Mark* 7.4. You will not underſtand that to have been dipping their beds into water (that would quickly have rotted and made them uſeleſs and unwholſom) but of ſome light ſprinkling with water: So when they came from the market, they *eat not*, ἐὰν μὴ βαπτίζωνται--- *except they be baptized*: You will not underſtand, *except they be dipt over head and ears in the water*; but, except they waſhed as our tranſlation gives it, after the *Syriac*; neither had they in that dry Climate, convenience and ſtore of waters every where to dive into. They had commonly their ὑδρίας, *water-pots*, after the *manner of the purifying of the Jews*, John 2.6. out of which they drew a little, for *luſtrations* or *ſprinklings*.

Matth. 3.11. Acts 2.3.

βαπτισμὸς---- ܟܠܝܢ Syr. רדעתם תא-- Latinus, &c. & Iſaiah.

אלא עמרין Niſi abluant Tremel.

Moreover, the *Iſraelites*, 1 Cor. 10.2. ἐβαπτίσαντο ἐν τῇ νεφέλῃ, *were baptized in the cloud* — not dipt into it, but beſprinkled with the diſtilling drops thereof: for the *prepoſition* ἐν there uſed, in ſuch expreſſions, ſignifieth not *in*, but *with*; as, *He ſhall baptize you* ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ καὶ πυρί *with* (not in) *the holy Ghoſt and fire*, Matth 3.11. So *Rev.* 19.21. *The reſt were ſlain*, ἐν τῇ ῥομφαίᾳ, *with* (not in) *the ſword*, it is an uſual *Hebraiſm* בְּחֶרֶב, *in the ſword*; that is, *with the ſword*, Exod.6.6. *I will redeem you*, בִּזְרוֹעַ *in brachio extenſo*. So Deut. 5.15. *The Lord thy God brought thee out thence.* בְּיָד חֲזָקָה וּבִזְרֹעַ נְטוּיָה *in*, that is, *by a mighty hand, and a ſtretched out arm.* Again, the ſons of *Zebedee* were to be baptized with the baptiſm of blood, *Mark* 10.39. that is, in *Tertullians* phraſe, *Ruſſati ſuo ſanguine*, beſmeared, or wet with drops of their own blood; not dipt into blood. The ſame uſe of ἐν, derived from the *Hebrews*, we often finde in the *new Teſtament*, *Rom.*10.9. 1 *Cor.*4.21. 1 *Pet.* 1.11. *Rev.*2.16. & 12.5. & 19.15.

ב *In Principio nominum notat caſum ablativum, quo inſtrumentum, cauſa, modus agendi, &c. ſignificatur. vide ſi vacat. Shindl. Penteg. See the like* 2.17. 47. *Gen.* 27. 40. & 32 30. & 48. 22. *Exod.*17.13. *Numb.*21.24, *&c. Tertul. de corona militis* c 1

3. It is granted, that Chriſt and many others were baptized in *Jordan*, and that *Philip* did go down into the water to baptize the *Eunuch*, and that ſuch baptiſms in hot Climates have, and may lawfully be uſed; yet no ſcripture-proof at all appears, that Chriſt in his own perſon was dived under water, or the *Eunuch*, or any of thoſe whom *John* or any of the Apoſtles baptized; neither do we at all deny immerſion to be lawful; but we deny it to be ſo neceſſary, as to the excluſion of waſhing or ſprinkling, as if they were not as effectually uſed: We deny that dipping in rivers is ſo neceſſary to baptiſm, as that none ought to be accounted baptized, but thoſe who are dipt after ſuch a manner: And we ſay, that where we have other conveniencies in the ſettled *Churches*, that practiſe appeareth meerly *Schiſmatical*, affected and unneceſſary.

Baptiſm being a ſign, muſt anſwer to the thing ſignified; as 1. *The waſhing of the whole ſoul in the blood of Chriſt.* 2. *That intereſt which the Saints have in the death, burial, and reſurrection of Chriſt, is not partial, but total; ſo therefore ought the baptizing of the body to be.*

We

We anſwer: 1: It muſt ſtill be remembred, that this ſacrament may be rightly and effectually adminiſtred by any of the three ways, dipping, waſhing or ſprinkling, and we approve of dipping, where cuſtom and convenience require it, ſo far, as that it excludes not the other: For a divers cuſtom of ſeveral Churches, makes no difference, where they all hold one faith in the main.

Immerſio, vel aſperſio trina an una, ἀδιαφορον eſſe putamus, pro loco, tempore, & eccleſiæ conſuetudine. An. Fayt. Enchirid. Theol. de Sacr. bapt. Urſin. Cate. in. de bapt.

2. It is not in the quaintity of the *Element*, but the inſtitution of Chriſt, the vertue of his death and paſſion, and the powerful working of his holy Spirit, which gives the fruit and effect of baptiſm; therefore *John* 3.5. the Spirit is mentioned with water, becauſe the power of regenerating is not of the water, but of Gods Spirit and Ordinance effectually working by the water of baptiſm: And here we may note, that Infants are capable of this operation, as hath been proved; and Chriſt in his inſtitution of baptiſm, preſcribed not (ſo far as can appear in Scripture) how much water muſt be uſed herein, nor how deep it muſt be (as there is no *quantum* of the elements preſcribed in the *Euchariſt*) neither is there in all the new Teſtament, either one precept for, or example of plunging or douſing the party to be baptized over head and ears under water.

In una fide nihil efficit ſanctæ eccleſiæ conſuetudo diverſa. Greg. Ep. 41. ſordes---& maculas mentis lavare non poteſt, niſi qui ejuſdem fabricator eſt mentis. Optatus l. 5. Dicimur in baptiſmo ſepulti cum Chriſto, reſurrexiſſe etiam in Chriſto vel per Chriſtum, ne hæc ſupernaturalia effecta, vel externo elemento, vel noſtris propriis viribus tribuamus. Chriſti itaque mors, ſepultura, reſurrectio cauſa eſt mortificationis & vivificationis noſtræ ſpiritualis, &c. Davenant. q. ſup. Nomen eſt quod ſanctificat non opus. Optatus. q. ſup.

3. In Circumciſion, the whole body was not cut, but onely the foreskin of the fleſh, whereby the whole perſon, body and ſoul was ſealed and admitted into Gods Covenant; and ſo is it proportionably in baptiſm, the ſeal of Gods preſent Covenant: In common uſe we know the ſeal of a writing obligatory is not ſet all over the deed, but to ſome one part, by which the whole is confirmed; and as in *Livery* and *Seiſin*, a little turf of graſs, with a twig or ſmal bough delivered to the Purchaſer, inveſteth him in the whole ſtate of the demeaſn: So here, 'tis the ſeal and ſubſcription of a juſt Deed which paſſeth the eſtate, not the qnantity of the

wax, or largeneſs of the parchment, nor greatneſs of the *Character*, whether *Text-hand*, *Chancery*, *Court-hand*, *Secretary*; all theſe things are circumſtantial, and no more: and ſo is it in the matter of much or little water in baptiſm, the eſſence whereof is applying water to the body of the baptized in the name of the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy Ghoſt. There is therefore no ſimple neceſſity of dipping the whole body under water; it is ſufficient if the face, (which is as it were the repreſentative, or *epitome* of man, in which are united all the ſenſes) be dipped, waſht, or ſprinkled.

Totum corpus mergi non eſt neceſſe. Aliquando enim unius partis ablutio eandem naturæ cum totius ablutione. Dan. Chamier. To. 4. lib. 5. c. 2. de Baptiſmo; uno corporis membro aqua baptiſmi loco totius hominis, regnante ubique Spiritu ſancto perficitur. Jo. Gerhard. de ſ. Bapt. c. 5. n. 59.

4 In baptiſm lawfully adminiſtred by waſhing, ſprinkling or dipping, the elect have the ſame intereſt in the death, burial and reſurrection of Chriſt, as if they were baptized in the deepeſt channel of *Jordan*, or any other water: Faith, whichinſtrumentally gives them intereſt in Chriſt, being no effect of deep waters, but of thoſe *Rivers of living waters* whereof Chriſt ſpake, *John* 7. 38, 39. *to wit, the Holy Ghoſt.*

5 Sprinkling doth alſo aptly ſignifie our ſprinkling with the blood of Chriſt in baptiſm, cleanſing us from our ſins, and ſealing our election, 1 *John* 1.7. 1 *Pet.* 1.2. and pouring water, ſignifieth the effuſion of the Spirit upon us, *Tit.* 3.5. and thoſe ſprinklings of the blood of ſacrifices, ſignified the very ſame.

Chriſt being baptized, is ſaid to have come up out of the Water, Matth. 3.16. *therefore he was in it: And the* Eunuch *went down into the Water with* Philip; *in neither appears any ſprinkling or waſhing, but rather dipping.*

We anſwer: 1. It appears that Chriſt and the Eunuch were baptized: it appears not that either they, or any other whom *John B* or any of Chriſts Diſciples baptized, were dipped all under water (as hath been ſaid) any more then that they were

were waſhed or ſprinkled with water. The word *Baptizing* in the original ſignifying ſprinkling, waſhing or dipping; therefore we take it to be indifferent which of the three ways baptiſm be adminiſtred, reſpect being had to convenience of times, places and perſons.

2. The *Preposition* ἀπὸ in the cited places, rendred *Out of*, ſignifieth properly *From*; as, ἀπὸ νηῶν, *From* (not from *under*) *the ſhips*; and ſo Chriſt might come *from the water*, though he were never dived under it, or though he had gone only to the depth of the firſt or ſecond meaſure of the *Sanctuary waters*, to the *anckles*, or to the *knees*.

ἀπὸ τοῦ ὕδατος, *Matth.* 3,16. ἀπὸ reſpondet *Latinis præpoſitionibus, A, Ab, E, &c. Vid. Wiger de præcip. Græc. dictionis l.* 9. *ſect.* 1. *n.* 11. *Ezek* 37.3,4. *Joh.* 3.15. & 13.2,16. 1 *Chron.* 12. 5.

3. *Philip* and the *Eunuch* are ſaid to have gone down into the water, *Act.* 8.38. for it was a deſcent to them; the waters (though ſhallow, or poſſibly not within very low or hollow banks, as *Jordan* and all great waters of Rivers uſually run) yet always running lower then the *Superficies* of the earth near the ſources and channels thereof.

4 The words *Acts* 8.38. are καὶ κατέβησαν ἀμφότεροι, *And both of them deſcended, &c.* ſo the word alſo ſignifieth, to *deſcend*, or to *alight*; as, καταβαίνειν ἀπὸ τοῦ ἵππου, to *alight from* (not to come from under) *an horſe*: or to *deſcend*, or *let down ones ſelf*; or *to come down from ſome higher place*; as, κατάβα κακόηθες (ἀντὶ τοῦ κατάβηθι, ſaith *Budæus*, after *Suidas*) or to go down to ſome even place, as to inveſt an enemy, to wreſtle, fight, or encountre; alſo to go from one place to another; as *Acts* 17.15. it is ſaid —κατέβη δὲ Ἰακώβ. *Jacob deſcended*, or *went into Egypt*, Acts 10. 20. κατάβηθι —— *Get thee down and go with them.* So *Acts* 14.25. κατέβησαν εἰς Ἀτάλειαν, *they went down unto* Attalia; for ſo they uſually expreſſed going from one place to another; as the *Hebrews* by יָחַת. So far is that word κατέβησαν *Acts* 8. 38. *they went down both to*, or *into the water*, from inforcing the concluſion aimed at (*therefore the* Eunuch *baptized was dived under water*) that it makes nothing for it, more then that *Jacob* going down into *Egypt*, was therefore duckt in *Nilus*, or *Peter* in the waters of *Ceſarea*, or *Paul* and *Barnabas* in ſome *Attalian* waters; becauſe theſe were ſaid in the very ſame word, to *go down* to theſe places.

Ariſtophan. Ἔπειτα καὶ κατέβαινεν, ἐς ἀρχὴν χαλκεῖον. *Schol.*

all

all which being frivolous and vain, your aſſertion muſt be left unconcluded, for any thing to the contrary in theſe cited Texts appearing. Add hereto, that here is nothing ſaid of the *Eunuch*, as going down into the water, more then of *Philip* (for they both *went down, &c.*) now I ſuppoſe you will not affirm, that *Philip*, as, and then when he baptized the *Eunuch*, in that adminiſtration, ſtood all under water with the *Eunuch*; or that *John B.* in the like action in *Jordan*, was ever douſed over head and ears for company: And how then can it hence appear, that the baptized were more dived then the baptizers? Behold upon what unſound grounds our *Antagoniſts* build their pretended neceſſity of ducking their diſciples in Rivers or deep waters.

CHAP. V.

Proteſtants arguments againſt the ſuppoſed neceſsity of dipping, rather then ſprinkling or waſhing with water in Baptiſm.

THat which the word uſed by Chriſt (enjoyning the duty of Baptiſm) doth indifferently ſignifie, and commonly import (there being neither expreſs example nor precept to reſtrain it preciſely to either) that is lawfully and warrantably to be done in baptizing: But the word uſed by Chriſt enjoyning the duty of Baptiſm (or Baptizing) doth indifferently and commonly ſignifie dipping, waſhing or ſprinkling; and there is no expreſs example or precept (in Scripture) to reſtrain it preciſely to either; Therefore in Baptizing we may lawfully and warrantably (*pro more loci, temporis & ſtatu perſonarum*) either dip, waſh, or ſprinkle in water (*In the name of the Father, and the Son, and of the Holy Ghoſt*) The *major* is out of controverſie. The *minor* thus confirmed: The Word uſed by Chriſt, *Matthew* 28. 19, is,

βαπτίζοντες. and βαπτίζειν, signifieth indifferently, *to waſh, ſprinkle*, or *dip*; and as the learned Mr. *Leigh* well noteth, it is taken largely *for any kinde of Waſhing, Rinſing* or *Cleanſing, even when there is no dipping at all.* So *Æmilius Portus* gives it by *mergo, immergo, tingo, intingo, madefacio, lavo, abluo, &c. Suidas* interpreteth βάπτων, by πλύνων, *lavans.* The ſame word ſignifieth waſhing or ſprinkling in many places of Scripture, and from neceſſary conſequences.

παρὰ τὸ βάπτειν, ἀ verbo δαΐω differt quod profundum etere, & ſubtermergere ſignificat. Mr. *Leigh. Crit. Sacr.* primum parva

βία βάπτει θερμῷ. *Lavant aquâ calidâ. Ariſtophan.*

1. From the types of that which was ſignified in the old Teſtament, which the holy Ghoſt (as hath been noted) calleth *Baptiſms* or *Waſhings*: to wit, by Sprinklings: for how were they performed? ſee *Numb.* 19.20. לֹא־זֹרַק עָלָיו the 70. gives it ὕδωρ ῥαντισμοῦ, *the water of Separation hath not been* Sprinckled *upon him*: ſo is it often named there: and *Levit.* 4.17. *The Prieſt ſhall dip his finger in the blood, and* Sprinkle *it ſeven times, &c.* 70. ῥανεῖ ἑπτάκις. So *Lev.* 14.16. and *Lev.* 16.14,15. *he ſhall take the blood of the bullock,* καὶ ῥανεῖ, *and ſhall ſprinkle it with his finger.* So Numb. 8.7. *Thus ſhalt thou do unto them to cleanſe them,* Sprinkle *water of purifying upon them.* So *Numb.* 19. 18, 19. *A clean perſon ſhall take hyſope and dip it into the water, and* Sprinkle *it upon the Tent* —— *and upon the perſons* —— ſo *Exod.* 24.8. *Moſes took the blood, and* Sprinkled *it on the people, and ſaid, Behold the* Blood of the Covenant, *which the Lord hath made with you*: which ſignified the blood of Chriſt to cleanſe them from ſin, as the water of Baptiſm now doth: And theſe very *Sprinklings* the holy Ghoſt calleth *Baptiſms*, Heb. 9. 10. 13, 20. where the myſtery is clearly unfolded.

καὶ διαφόροις βαπτισμοῖς, *Heb.* 9.10.

ῥαίνω perfundo, aſpergo, irroro, ut ῥαίνω, εἰς τὰ βλέφαρα. *Ariſtophan.* aſpergo palpebras. ῥαντίζω, idem, inde ῥαντισμα, & ῥαντισμὸς, aſperſio. *Lactan. l.4.c.15* (vocat baptiſmum) purificatoris aſperſionem

1 *John* 1. 7.

2. From the truth thereby ſignified: So *Ezek.* 36. 25. וְזָרַקְתִּי עֲלֵיכֶם 70. καὶ ῥανῶ ἐφ' ὑμᾶς ὕδωρ καθαρὸν ὕδως, *I will ſprinkle you with clean water,* (or —— *clean water upon you*) *and ye ſhall be clean*: how? The Apoſtle telleth us, 1 *Pet.* 1,2. εἰς ὑπακοὴν καὶ ῥαντισμὸν αἵματος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, unto obedience (that

(that is, by the Spirit of Sanctification) *and* Sprinkling *of the blood of Jeſus Chriſt*; as, Heb. 10. 22. *Let us draw near with a true heart, in full aſſurance of faith, having our hearts* Sprinkled *from an evil conſcience, and our bodies waſhed with pure water*; that is the water mentioned by *Ezekiel*, the purifying water of baptiſm; and Heb. 12. 24. *We are come to Jeſus the Mediator of the new Covenant, and to the blood of* Sprinkling —— that is, the application of the blood and merit of Chriſt in Baptiſm, for the remiſſion of our ſins.

ἅιματι ῥαντισμῶ.

3. From neceſſary conſequences, from the common uſe of the words βαπτίζειν and βαπτισμὸς in Scriptures, where they cannot reaſonably be interpreted by dipping, but by waſhing or ſprinkling; as *Matth.* 26. 23. ὁ ἐμβάψας μετ' ἐμοῦ, &c. he did not dip his whole fiſt into the diſh, but only wet his fingers therein: So *Matth.* 20. 23. *Chriſt* mentioneth his baptiſm, which all underſtand of his blood-ſhedding, not dipping therein but beſprinkling therewith. So *Luke* 11. 38. when the Phariſee invited Chriſt to dinner, *he wondred*, ὅτι οὐ πρῶτον ἐβαπτίσθη —— *that he had not firſt waſhed before dinner*; it cannot there reaſonably be interpreted, *that he had not firſt been dipt over head and ears in water.* So 1 Cor. 10. 2. *They were all baptized unto Moſes in the cloud and in the ſea*: No reaſonable man can think that all Iſrael, with their wives and children were dowſed into the ſea (nay, but they paſſed through dry-foot) nor were they dived into the cloud, but only as thoſe who were rinſed or wetted under a rainy cloud by the drops thereof diſtilling on them. So *Mark* 7. 4. ἐὰν μὴ βαπτίσωνται, to the letter, *Except they baptize*, or be *baptized*: he meaneth not by dipping the whole into the water; but as it is clearly manifeſted by the Holy Ghoſt (the beſt interpreter of himſelf) a little before, they eat not χοιναῖς χερσὶ, with *common hands*; that is, ἀνίπτοις, *unwaſhen*: and in the ſame place (as hath hath noted) we read alſo, βαπτισμοὺς —— κλινῶν, to the letter *Baptiſms of beds*; which was not by dipping into, but (though underſtood of tables, which they commonly made of *Couch-beds*

Baptiſmum qui fit per ſanguinem Euthyn. in Mark 20. 23.

ἐβαπτίσαντο ἐν τῇ νεφέλῃ, Mark 7. 2.

Lotiones lectorum. Ar. Montan. Beza, & c. Syr. וּרְעֵר סְתָא & lectorum. Tremel. Chald. & Syr. עֵרֶם lectus. ut Marc. 2. 4 (ab Hebr. Mat. 9. עֵרֶשׁ Pſa. 6. 6) 2. 6. interdum thalamus nuptialis. Hebr. 13. 4 Luc. 11. 7. & 17 34. Act. 9. 33. 2

beds ſet together) by ſprinkling them with a little water, which manner of purification they too ſuperſtitiouſly and commonly uſed.

As for the ſecond clauſe of our *minor* propoſition, we appeal to Scriptures, whether there be any expreſs example or precept reſtraining baptiſm only to dipping over head and ears.

2 In the Lords Supper the efficacie of the Sacrament is not in the quantitie of the element: a little bread, therein, is as good and effectual as a whole loaf: ſo here, it is not (as hath been ſaid) in the quantitie of the element, but in the ordinance of God, and operation of his Spirit: Now herein Chriſt never gave any precept concerning the *quantum*: the Word and the Element make the Sacrament; and a few drops ſprinkled, are as truly water as all *Jordan*.

3. If Baptiſm in the type thereof were adminiſtred by God by ſprinkling, then it is lawfully and effectually ſo to be adminiſtred by man in the truth (for in the main Analogy the truth muſt anſwer the type) But Baptiſm in the type was adminiſtred by ſprinkling (infants as well as perſons of years) for all Iſrael were baptized under the Cloud, 1 *Cor.* 10.2. Therefore Baptiſm may lawfully and effectually be adminiſtred by ſprinkling of water.

4. That adminiſtration of Baptiſm whereby Chriſt cleanſeth his Church, is lawfull and effectuall. But *Chriſt cleanſeth his Church with the waſhing of water through the word, Epheſ.* 5. 26. Therefore that adminiſtration of Baptiſm which is by waſhing with water (according to his precept, *Matth* 28. 19.) is lawfull and effectuall.

5. The *Goaler, Acts* 16. 33. was baptized about midnight, and it is improbable that he had any ſuch ſtore and convenience of water in his houſe, as to dip himſelf and family, or that they went out to ſome river at ſuch a ſeaſon; neither was it probable that three thouſand added to the Church in one day, durſt in thoſe times when *Chriſtians* were ſo eagerly perſecuted, go publickly with the Apoſtles to the poole of *Betheſda, Siloam*, or the brook *Cedron*, or any like place to be douſed: more probably they were baptized

Acts 2. *Videntur tria millia uno die à paucis Apoſtolis non potuiſſe baptizari ſi ſinguli merſi fuiſſent: nec vero, carcerario intra carcerem fuiſſe ad manum tantum aquæ quantum mergendo opus erat.* Dan. Chamier. de bapt. l. 15. c. 2.

baptized by waſhing or ſprinkling with water, as they had private accommodation thereto: nor could ſo many in one day have been baptized by a few Apoſtles, if all had been baptized by dipping.

6. If immerſion were ſimply neceſſary, and of the *Eſſence* of Baptiſm, then it might not be diſpenſed withall in caſe ſome ſick Convert ſhould deſire it before his death for the comfort and peace of his afflicted conſcience, which were extream uncharitableneſs, which belongs not to any Ordinance of God. Therefore it cannot be ſimply neceſſary.

7 That which can neither be proved by example of Chriſt, *John Baptiſt*, or any of the Apoſtles baptizing, nor by any precept of Chriſt concerning the ſame, is not eſſential or ſimply neceſſary to baptiſm: but dipping or dowſing in baptiſm, can neither be proved by example, *&c.* or any precept of Chriſt concerning the ſame: therefore diping or dowſing is not eſſential, or ſimply neceſſary to baptiſm: and indeed were there to be found in Scripture any example hereof, without a precept to lay the ſame univerſally upon the Ordinance, it were not binding, as hath been proved from Chriſts adminiſtring the communion with unleavened bread, after ſupper in an upper room to twelve men only and no women. So that if that which you can never prove, ſhould be granted you, that *John Baptiſt* and Chriſts diſciples, did then and there baptize by dipping; yet it would not follow that we ought to baptize in the like and no other manner. In the infancie of the Church they had not *Baptiſteries* or *Churches* as we have; there was a kind of neceſsitie for them as they met with occaſions, to make uſe of waters as they could find them in rivers or ſources; wherein it cannot be proved that they dipt: nor could it conclude our Antagoniſts pretended neceſsitie, if it were ſuppoſed.

8 Whatſoever was or is eſſential to baptiſm, or ſimply neceſſary thereto, is mentioned in ſome clear example or expreſs precept of Chriſt: But dipping the whole body in baptiſm is neither mentioned in any clear example, nor any expreſs precept of Chriſt: therefore it is not eſſential or

ſimply

ſimply neceſſary to baptiſm. Chriſt omitted nothing neceſſary, and the holy Scriptures are able to make men wiſe to ſalvation. And let our Antagoniſts now ſeriouſly conſider what they do, when they rebaptize upon that fancie, that waſhing or ſprinkling with water (in the Name of the Father, the Son, and the holy Ghoſt) is not true baptiſm.

2 Tim. 3. 16. &c.

CHAP. VI.

Anabaptiſts Arguments for their dangerous practice of Re-baptizing examined and anſwered.

THE malitious Serpent (ever attempting to poiſon or trouble theſe *ſanctuary-waters*, obſtructing, or hindering their effect, leſt they ſhould heal ſin-wounded ſouls) ſomtimes moved *Pelagius*, *Donatus*, and others, reviving their errors, to deny the moſt innocent children, of believers baptiſm; ſometimes he teacheth them to except againſt the manner of baptizing, as if the vertue of the Sacrament depended on the quantitie of the element, and not ſolely on the Ordinance and power of God working thereon: ſometimes he cauſeth deluded people to annul their baptiſm, and in effect, to renounce their faith, and Chriſt, whom they had ſacramentally put on in baptiſm, by receiving a ſecond, third, or iterated baptiſm: we read that the ἡμεροβαπτισταὶ baptized every day, ſuppoſing that their former baptiſms were made void by any ſin after committed: on which fancie, poſsibly the *Novatians* thought that baptiſm ought to be deferred to the end of their lives. *Auxentius* the *Arrian* taught that baptiſm ought ro be iterated: the *Marcionites* baptized their diſciples three times: The Anabaptiſts rebaptize baptized Infants coming to age, and affirm that *the aſſuming of*

De Eunomio dicit Epiphanius, ἀναβαπτίζει δὲ τοὺς ἐν ἁγίᾳ βαπτιζομένους, *Anom. hæreſ. 76. N. 6.* —*Auxentius ſolvit baptiſmum Chriſti*—*curigitur rebaptizandos Auxentius fideles populos putat baptizatos in nomine Trinitatis, &c? Ambroſ. l. 5. ep. 32: ſine, orat. in Auxent.*

Novatianus—*quos iterati baptiſmatis labe inquinavit. Ambroſ. de pœnit. l. 1. c. 6.* ἓν μόνον δὲ παρ' αὐτῷ ἓν λουτρὸν δίδοται, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἕως τρισὶν λουτροῖς. *Epiph. hæreſ. 42. to. 3. l. 1.* Mr. Tombs exercit. about Infant-baptiſm.

baptiſm in ripe years, by thoſe who were waſhed in Infancie, is not a renouncing baptiſm —— but a firmer avouching thereof according to Chriſts mind; errors are fruitful; one abſurdity granted, many will readily follow: they think, firſt that Infants having no preſent actual faith and repentance, nor preſent uſe of reaſon to underſtand the Goſpel preached, are not as ſuch to be baptized; but, until they come to years to be taught and to make profeſsion of their faith and repentance, to be kept from baptiſm; and that ſo Infant-baptiſm is void, and to be eſteemed no baptiſm.

Secondly, they dream that thoſe who are not dived under water, are not baptized, and therefore they rebaptize them who were baptized in Infancie; though that ground may often fail them, becauſe ſome have been baptized by immerſion. Now that which hath been ſaid on our part is enough to ſatisfie thoſe in thoſe things, who are not wilfully bent with *Simo* in the *Comedian*, rather to erre then to be directed by any. Therefore to avoid repetitions, let the iſſue be, if Infant-baptiſm, in the name of the Father, the Son, and the holy Ghoſt, either by waſhing, ſprinkling with, or dipping into water, be indeed a compleat and warrantable baptiſm according to the inſtitution of Chriſt; then Anabaptiſts rebaptizing, do impiouſly ſeduce and teach ſimple people to renounce that baptiſm by which they had, at leaſt ſacramentally, put on Chriſt, and thereby were re-admitted into that Church out of which can be no ſalvation. And let the prudent Reader judge, whom I herein refer to an impartial and ſerious conſideration of that which hath been ſaid: which being proved, the Anabaptiſts whole fabrick of dowſing and rebaptizing falleth heavily on their Dippers heads.

Errabo potius quàm perducter cuiſpiam. Plaut. Gellel.

Nam ſi eſſet diſſertus, diceret qui ſemel benè lotus fuerit: ſed dum non addidit verbum benè, in-

The Church of Chriſt holds, that Infants of enchurched Parents, or others of years converting to the faith, being once ſprinkled, waſhed, or dipt, in the name of the Father, the Son, and the holy Ghoſt, according to Chriſts inſtitu-

cleat quia quic quid in Trinitate factum fuerit, benè eſt, &c. Optatus l. 5. See Epiph. hæreſ. 65. N. 7. ib. hæreſ. 52. l. 2. N. 1. ib. hæreſ. 42. N. 2. ib. hæreſ. 69.

tion

tion, ought not on any pretence to be rebaptized. I ſay thus baptized according to the ordinance of Chriſt, becauſe the *Samoſatenians*, *Sabellians*, *Marcionites*, *Arrians*, or the like, who any wayes oppoſed the *holy Trinity*, or denied any perſons thereof, did not baptize according to the preſcript of Chriſt; and therefore in caſe any of their diſciples converted, the true Church baptized them; becauſe the former pretended baptiſm was not according to the Ordinance of Chriſt (and ſo no true baptiſm) it being the peculiar prerogative of Chriſt to appoint the ſeals of his own Covenant of free Grace and mercie with man.

But the Anabaptiſts after their manner, object:

We are regenerate, not only by Baptiſm, but alſo by the Word, Epheſ. 5. 26. 1 Pet. 1. 23. *but the Word is often repeated, and therefore ſo may baptiſm.* Obj. 1.

We anſwer, 1 The word mentioned, *Eph.*5.26. is that, which comming to the element, makes the Sacrament, as *Chryſoſtom* wel interpreteth, *that he might ſanctifie and cleanſe it with the waſhing of water, by the Word.* What Word? (ſaith he) *why, this, In the name of the Father, of the Son, and of the holy Ghoſt:* that Word which coming to the element makes the Sacrament, ought not to be more repeated then the Sacrament it ſelf, becauſe it is eſſential thereto. ἐν ῥήματι φησὶ, ποίῳ; ἐν ὀνόματι τοῦ πατρὸς, καὶ τοῦ υἱοῦ, καὶ τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος. *Chryſ. hom.* 2. *in Eph.* 5.

2 The regeneration of man, is only one, whoſe principal efficient cauſe is the holy Ghoſt: the means or inſtrumental cauſes, on Gods part, are the Word and Sacraments; on our part, faith which the holy Ghoſt begetteth, encreaſeth, and confirmeth ordinarily by thoſe external means. Therefore when they are baptized, who were before regenerate by the Word, as a ſpiritual ſeed, they have not need of any other regeneration, nor can they be twice regenerate; but then baptiſm is to them an *obſignation* and confirmation of their regeneration. So *Abraham* firſt believed (as ſo, was regenerate) and afterward was ſealed. So *Cornelius* ſpiritual ſanctification preceded in the gift of the holy Ghoſt, and then he received the Sacrament of regeneration, to confirm the ſame to him. But when the elect, who being baptized, Rom. 4. 11. *Vid. Aug. de bapt. l.* 4. *c.* 24.

tized, dye in their infancy, it is certain that they are regenerate by the Sacrament, without the miniſtry of the word preached unto them, whereof they are not capable, who yet without regeneration, could not enter into the Kingdom of God, *John* 3.5. And if the baptized Infant live to be capable of teaching, and ſo receive the word, as that it begets in him actual faith, repentance and obedience to God, then that word is as *Sincere milk*, to nouriſh and confirm, not to regenerate, but to promote the degrees of regeneration, producing that faith and the fruits thereof ſowed in baptiſm, to a clearer and more evident maturity. So was it in *Iſaac*, who was firſt regenerate by the ſeal of the righteouſneſs of faith, which was after he came to years nouriſhed and confirmed by the word preached unto him: So that though the word in the ordinary diſpenſation thereof, be often repeated, and doth by many degrees promote our regeneration, and cauſe us to grow to a better ſtature and ſtrength, according to our meaſure in Chriſt, of which we have continual need, yet it follows not thence that baptiſm may alſo be iterated; no more, then that a man may be often born into the world, becauſe he is often fed, and groweth up by degrees, and divers acceſſions to his ſtature.

Object. 2. *Though corporal generation or birth, be naturally but one, yet may it be ſupernaturally iterated: Yea, ſo ſhall it be in the reſurrection which our Saviour calleth Regeneration*, Matth 19.28.

ἐν τῇ παλιγγενεσια.

We anſwer: 1. The preſent queſtion is concerning regeneration in this life, not of that which ſhall be in the *new age*, as the *Syriac* hath it; that is, in the world to come.

בְּעָלְמָא חַדְתָּא

in ſeculo novo.

2. Chriſt there calleth the reſurrection regeneration, to teach us who have received the firſt fruits of the Spirit, in our regeneration, that admirable thing which ſhall come to paſs in our reſurrection; for ſo ſhall our fleſh be, as it were born again by incorruption, as our ſoul is now regenerate by faith in Chriſt.

Sic enim caro noſtra regenerabitur per incorruptionem, quemadmodum eſt anima noſtra regenerata per fidem. Auguſtin de C. D. l.10.c.5.

3. That

3. That regeneration in the end of the world ſhall be but once; therefore by proportion, regeneration in this world by baptiſm, muſt be, can be but once.

The ſpiritual death to ſin, is by many acts of regeneration, as examination of our ſelves, daily renewing our repentance, beating down our bodies by faſting, prayer, humiliation, and riſing again to newneſs of life in our encreaſes of faith; and growth in holineſs is by ſundry acts of the Spirit regenerating, and making our endeavours effectuall in the uſe of the means, as hearing, praying, receiving the Sacrament: In and by theſe is regeneration; therefore not one, nor only once: Add hereto, that we are baptized into remiſſion of ſins, which being daily, we have need of daily remiſſion, and therefore of Baptiſm. Object. 3. Acts 2. 38.

We anſwer: 1. That dying to ſin, and riſing to newneſs of life, are the certain effects of regeneration; and therefore it may conclude, that where theſe are, and their ſeveral acts appear, there undoubtedly is Regeneration: But it can no more conclude divers Regenerations, then the divers acts of a living man, can prove that he had ſeveral Generations or Births, becauſe theſe prove that he liveth.

2. Our need of daily pardon for our daily ſins may conclude our daily need of repentance, as our Saviour taught us; but it concludes not any neceſſity to iterate our Baptiſm, but rather the contrary, becauſe the Covenant of God once ſealed to us in Baptiſm (for the free remiſſion of all our ſins, through the ineſtimable and never dying-merit of Chriſts death, into which we are implanted by Baptiſm) is unchangably perpetual; and the condition of our comfortable aſſurance of pardon, cannot be iteration of our Baptiſm, but renewing of our repentance, and amendment of our lives, which demonſtrate our faith to be lively. See *Jer.* 3. 12, 13. *Ezek.* 16. 60. Nor doth that hinder which ſome object; Some hypocrites receive the ſeal, therefore they have need to receive it again, that they may obtain the fruits thereof, which believing they ſhall have: Matth. 6. Ier. 31. 34.

It

It follows not, that they ought to be baptized again, but that they ought to be ſincere, and to repent of their hypocriſie, and then the ſeal formerly received, ſhall be effectual for them to Remiſsion of ſins and Salvation.

Object. 4. *Spiritual death in ſin, is by many acts; and Regeneration is a riſing again from the ſame, which in the regenerate, who alſo often fall, muſt and is often to be iterated; therefore Regeneration may and muſt be iterated, and conſequently, ſo muſt Baptiſm, the Laver of Regeneration.*

We anſwer; 1. The acts of Regeneration are many, but that proves not pluralities of Regenerations, more then many acts of life prove many lives of one and the ſame perſon, as we ſaid.

2. As many wounds, or other concurrent cauſes of death, conclude not many deaths of one and the ſame perſon, ſo 'tis here; many ſins wound and ſpiritually deſtroy the ſoul, yet are there not more deaths then lives of one man; for death is a privation of life: So that our often falling into ſin, concludes only a need of frequent renewing our repentance; and hath been ſhewed.

Object. 5. *That which the Apoſtles of Chriſt did, that we may do in the Work of the Miniſtry: But they rebaptized, as may appear* Acts 19. 4,5. *therefore we may rebaptize.*

We anſwer. 1. This main argument which the *Anabaptiſts* have, is built, as the reſt, upon a meer miſtake of that Scripture *S. Luke* thus relateth, *Then*, ſaid *Paul*, *John verily baptized with the baptiſm of repentance; ſaying unto the people, that they ſhould believe on him which ſhould come after him, that is, on Chriſt Jeſus. When they heard this* (to wit, that which *John* ſpake) *they* (that is, the people mentioned *verſe* 4. which heard thoſe words of *John B.*) *were baptized*; that is, by *John B.* or his Diſciples, not by *Paul*; for he is only ſaid, *verſe* 6. to have laid his hands upon them, that they might be confirmed in their receiving the extraordinary gifts of the Holy Ghoſt, of which thoſe Diſciples

Diſciples to whom *Paul* there ſpake, had not before that time, *ſo much as heard*, verſe 2.

2. There was no difference in ſubſtance or ſignification between the Baptiſm of *John B.* and that which was adminiſtred by the Diſciples of Chriſt, as hath been ſhewed. *Vid. doctiſſimum. A. Rivet. ſum controver. To. 2. q. 2. tra. 3. page 26,27.*

3. It is not ſaid in the cited place, that *Paul* baptized them; but onely, that he laid his hands on them (as we noted.) Add hereto, that his ſelf ſaith, *That he baptized only Criſpus and Gaius, and the houſhold of Stephanus*; but beſides, he knew not whether he baptized any other. Now *Criſpus* was a *Corinthian*, *Gaius* a *Macedonian*, and *Stephanus* of *Achaia*, 1 Cor. 16.15. but 'tis apparent that theſe Diſciples mentioned *Acts* 19. were *Epheſians*, verſe 1. and *Epheſus* a City of *Aſia*, Rev. 1.11. therefore he baptized them not; and ſo here was no rebaptizing. *1 Cor. 1.14.16 Acts 18.8. Acts 19 29.*

4. Theſe words (*When they heard this*) do not at all relate to the ſpeech of *Paul* there hiſtorified, but unto the preaching of *John B.* for if otherwiſe, it would follow, which the Papiſts affirm, that *Johns* baptiſm was not the ſame with the Baptiſm of Chriſt; and conſequently, that Chriſt whom *John* baptized, and we, baptized by the ſucceſſors of Chriſts Diſciples, are not baptized with one and the ſame baptiſm; whereas Chriſt bare the ſame circumciſion which the Jews, and for ſubſtance the ſame baptiſm with us Gentiles, that he might declare himſelf the Saviour both of Jews and Gentiles. *Concil. Trident. Bellarmin. To 3 de Sacram. bapt. l. 2. c. 20. Vaſquez. in 3. Tho. Aquin. Tom. 2. q. 66. a. 2. diſp. 140. N. 18. P. Lombard. l. 4. diſt. 2. D. Aquin. part. 3, &c.*

The Lords Supper doth no leſs ſignifie the blood of Chriſt for our Salvation, then doth the water of Baptiſm; nor leſs repreſent his death, then doth baptiſm, in which we are implanted into the ſimilitude of his death and reſurrection: But the Lords Supper is often to be adminiſtred and received; and therefore ſo is Baptiſm. *Object. 6.* Rom, 6.4,5.

We anſwer: 1. There is in Scripture expreſs command

for often adminiſtring and receiving of the Lords Supper, 1 *Cor.* 11. 24. *This do in remembrance of me* —— *As often as ye eat this bread, and drink this cup, ye do ſhew the Lords death till he come:* ſhew us any one ſuch warrant for rebaptizing, and this controverſie is at an end.

Verſe 25, 26.

2. The Lords Supper propoſeth not any new Covenant with God, but confirmeth that to us, which he made with us in our baptiſm: But baptiſm is the *Initiatory Seal* of our entring into Covenant with God (as it was in circumciſion) which Covenant is but one.

3. The vertue and efficacy of baptiſm in the elect, extendeth it ſelf to the whole life of the regenerate, and is, as it were, a fountain of living waters, perpetually running to cleanſe away the pollutions of ſin; ſo that there need not new or more baptiſms, but a daily renewing of our repentance, to which we were in our covenanting with God, at firſt baptized. As *Ambroſe* ſaith, after baptiſm there remaineth no remedy but true repentance.

Obj. 7. *Cyprian and the Councel of* Carthage, *held, that thoſe who were baptized by hereticks, upon their return to the Church, ought to be rebaptized.*

We anſwer: 1. The queſtion being propoſed in the firſt Councel of *Carthage*, Whether thoſe who were once baptized, might be rebaptized; all the Biſhops anſwered, *God forbid, God forbid*; we reſolve and determine, that all rebaptizings are *unlawful, and far from ſincere faith and catholick diſcipline*. The buſineſs which troubled the Churches in *Cyprians* time was, Whether baptiſm adminiſtred according to the lawful form of the *Catholick Church* (that is, with water, in the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghoſt) though by an Heretical Miniſter, were in-

Univerſi Epiſcopi dixerunt abſit, abſit: illicitas eſſe ſancimus rebaptizationes omnes, & ſatis eſſe alienum à ſincerâ fide & Catholicâ diſciplinâ —— *Concil.* 1. *Carthag. cap.* 1. *Severin. Bin. Concil. To.* 1.

valid,

valid, and therefore to be iterated. *Cyprian*, with other Eaſtern Biſhops, affirmed, that there is but *one Baptiſm*, which is not to be found out of the *Catholick Church*. The other orthodox Biſhops determined, that baptiſm which an heretical Miniſter adminiſtred according to the form preſcribed by Chriſt, and practiſed by the Church, was valid, and not to be iterated. So that indeed, neither *Cyprian*, nor the reſt of that Councel, did maintain rebaptizing, but held that there could be no true or valid baptiſm out of the *Catholick Church*; or that it was not baptiſm which Hereticks adminiſtred. Againſt rebaptizing, *Cyprian* ſpeaks clearly, *L.* 1. *Ep.* 12. on that *John* 4.14, applying it to baptiſm; Which, ſaith he, is *once received, and not again iterated*: And in the *Canons* of the Apoſtles, there is a ſevere caution againſt rebaptizing, *If any Biſhop or Elder ſhall again baptize him who had truly received baptiſm, let him be depoſed.*

Cyprianus affirmabat cum aliis Orientalibus Epiſcopis--. unum eſſe baptiſmum, qui extra unam Eccleſiam Catholicam, non inveniatur—— (alii dicebant) illud baptiſma, ratum validum, & nequa quam reiterandum .. quem Miniſter hæreticus juxta formam à Chriſto præſcriptam & ab Eccleſia uſurpatam, contuliſſ. Bin q.ſ. Videat qui vult

Auguſtin. ad Vincent. ep.48. & de bapt.contr. Donat. l.6.c.2. Hieronymum contr. Luciferian. Baptiſmum autem non eſſe quo hæretici utuntur. Cyprian 1. &c. Stephan. l.2. ep. 1. quis enim poteſt dare quod ipſe non habeat? ib. Cypr.l.1.ep 12. quod ſemel ſumitur nec rurſus iteratur. Cyprian. l.2.ep.3 & Bin. q.ſ.

2. We muſt diſtinguiſh between Hereticks (as hath been ſaid) whereof ſome are ſuch, as that though they err in ſome fundamental point or points; yet they hold the true form of baptiſm. Some ſo erre concerning the holy Trinity, as that in ſuch errour they cannot have with them the true form and eſſence of baptiſm: Now there may be true baptiſm adminiſtred by the firſt ſort; and ſuch as are baptized by them, returning to the true Church, muſt repent, but not to be rebaptized: But thoſe who were pretended to be baptized by the ſecond ſort, as *Arians*, denying the Deity of Chriſt, or thoſe *Pneumatomachi*, *Eunomius*, and others, blaſphemous againſt the holy Ghoſt, in caſe they came to the true Church, they were to be baptized, becauſe there can be no true baptiſm, where the eſſentials

ἐπίσκοποι, ἢ πρεσβύτεροι ἢ κατ' ἀλλοίαν ἔχουσι βάπτισμα. ἐὰν ἄνωθεν βαπτίσωσι —— χρὴ αὐτοὺς

ρείδω, &c. Apoſt. Can. 46. Μακεδόνιος ὁ πνευματομάχος, ἢ οἱ περὶ τοῦτα Εὐνόμιος, &c. Theophylact. in Ioh. 3. videat qui vult de his, Epiphan. hæreſ. 74. contra Pneumatomachos. Init. & hæreſ. 76. N. 6.

thereof are wanting; as the element, and the word constituting the Sacrament; to wit, *In the Name of the Father, the Son, and the holy Ghost:* Baptizing such as have not so been baptized, is no rebaptizing, seeing the first pretended was truly none. Otherwise, the ancient *Church* did not rebaptize a repenting *Apostate*, though he had fallen into the errours of *Arrians*, *Eunomians*, or the like, after that he had been baptized by the true Church; and the reason thereof was, that which *Chemnitius* well observed; as on Gods part, the Covenant which he made with the circumcised *Israelites*, remained firm and ratified, unto which after their falling into sin, they returned by repentance, so the *Corinthians* and *Galathians* having fallen, were recalled by S. *Paul*, and remitted to the promise and consolation of their baptism formerly received: Therefore as Circumcision was not, so ought not baptism to be iterated.

Præter Ecclesiæ consuetudinem, &c. ἀναβαπτίζειν τὰς ἐξ ἑτερόδοξων εἰς ἑαυτοὺς ἐλθόντας ἐπὶ Ἀρειανῶν. Epiphan. exposit. Cath. l. 3. To 2. N. 13.

See 1 Cor. 6. 11. & 12. 13. Gal. 3. 27.

CHAP. VII.

Protestants arguments against the dangerous practice of Rebaptizing.

1. *See Concil. Nicen. can. 19. Concil. Arelat. Can 8. Concil. Carthag. c. 4. ἐπὶ τοῦ δευτέρας ἀναγεννήσεως, &c.*

BAptism is the *Sacrament of Regeneration* by our implantation into Christ. But we cannot be twice regenerate (for regeneration presupposeth a precedent natural birth, which can be but one: nor can we be more often regenerate or born a new, then born naturally) therefore we ought not to be twice baptized. The *major*

Nazianz. orat. 40. itemque orat. 25. inquit εἷς Κύριος, μία πίστις, ἓν βάπτισμα, εἰ τοῦτο ἀληθεύει μισπαρὲξ πίνος ἔξω τὸ δεύτερον; τί φατέ, οἱ χ βαπτίζοντες ἢ ἀναβαπτίζοντες; ——— Regeneratio spiritualis una est, sicut generatio carnalis una est. Aug. tract. 12. in Joh. ——— Quomodo uterus non potest repeti, sic nec baptismus iterari. Prosper. post Augustin. tract. 11. in Joh. vid. & Chrysost. in Hebr. 6. hom. 9. & Theophylact. ib.

is

is evident, *Tit.*3.5. The *minor* is also evident in reason. Add hereto, that whereas we are by *nature children of wrath*, Ephes.2.3. *enemies to God*, *Rom* 5.10. and so without a new birth, *aliens from the Kingdom of God*, John 3. 5. but being implanted into Christ by baptism, we become καινὴ κτίσις, *a new creature*, 2 Cor.5.17. *Gal* 6.15. Now as one and the same creature can be but once created (except that either the created *essence* of a man is destroyed by sin, which the sin of the Devil cannot do; or that a man may have pluralities of essences by several creations of one and the same person, which no reason can suppose) so neither can we have any more then one regeneration: Therefore we ought to be but once baptized.

2. Gods faithfulness in his Covenant sealed, cannot become void by mans infidelity; neither is his Covenant of peace *momentany*, but perpetual, which is sealed in baptism; so that still we may return unto it by true repentance: See *Isa.* 54. 10. and so they who sinned after baptism, though notoriously and scandalously, were not rebaptized by the ancient *Church*, but upon their repentance received again into holy communion; and it is truly observed by some, that baptism being once received, confirmeth and assureth the penitent of their sins remission, and that the efficacy and vertue thereof extendeth it self to all our life; and therefore neither ought it to be iterated, nor deferred unto the end of our lives, as if it so only cleansed men from their sins, upon condition that they never fall into any sin after their baptism received; which cannot be in this frail state of flesh and blood subject to so many temptations and innate infirmities: Therefore after the Apostle had shewed us how being implanted into the similitude of Christs death and resurrection, we ought not to suffer sin *to reign in our mortal bodies*; he saith not, Let not flesh and blood, the natural man live any longer, or any more be active, but, *Let not sin reign*, &c. for Christ

Rom 3.3. *Rom.* 11. 29. 2 *Tim.* 2.13.

Concil. Eliberit. Can. 46. & 69. & 73. *Concil. Carthag.* 1. *Concil. Arelatens.* c. 6. 23. *Concil. Nicæn.* 2. *vid. & Bart. Carranz, sum. Concil. pag* 673. 679. *Rothomag.* 1633. *nec aliud remedium constitutum esse post baptismum, quam pœnitentiæ solatium. Ambros. to.* 1. *Ursin. de relig. Christ pa.* 2. *Conclus.* 13.

Rom.6.11. *Christ. in Rom.* 6 *hom* 11.

Chriſt came not to deſtroy our nature, but to correct our depraved will and affections.

3 There is not in all the New *Teſtament* any one precept or example for rebaptizing; therfore it ought not to be done: the conſtant judgment and practice of the Church of Chriſt being to the contrary: it is neither commanded in the inſtitution of baptiſm, nor in any Scripture admitted: nor is it tolerable by any neceſſary conſequence, as is the contrary. *Johns* baptiſm and Chriſts were one, whatever Jeſuites pretend to the contrary: *Apollos* knew only *Johns* baptiſm, *Act.*18.25. that is, the *doctrine of John Baptiſt*; we read not that *Apollos* or any other mentioned in Scripture, was rebaptized; no not any of *Johns* Diſciples coming to Chriſt and his magiſtery, which had ſurely been done, had *Chriſts* baptiſm and *Johns* been different in ſubſtance; and had it been done, we ſhould have had in Scripture either ſome expreſs proof for the ſame, or ſomething ſo layed down, that we might by good conſequence have gathered the ſame, which nowhere appeareth: but (as hath been ſaid) the Apoſtle recalleth penitent ſinners once baptized, unto the comfort of that which they had once received in baptiſm, 1 *Cor.* 6. 11. 1 *Cor.*12.13. & *Gal.*3.27.

Gen.17.7. לִבְרִית עוֹלָם *in pactum ſeculi*

Circumciſion was only once adminiſtred, but was perpetual and everlaſting; and under the Law ſinners were to return unto the Lord by true repentance; compare *Jer.*11. 3,4. *Jer.*4.1,2. &c. with *Jer.* 18.8. &c. *Ezek.*18.31,32. *Iſa.*55. and the principal cauſe why circumciſion was not iterated, was Gods divine ordinance and inſtitution; the impreſſed *character* was ſecondary: on Gods part it ever remained ſure, to which after their forſaking his covenant, into which they had been once ſealed, he recalled them not to a ſuſception of a new, or the ſame ſeal iterated, but only to repentance, as to humble them, ſo to ſhew that the fault and failing of the fruits and effects thereof (which ſhould have appeared in their newneſs of life) was wholly on their parts, not on Gods, who is unchangeable and the ſame for ever. So hath he appointed it in our ſins after baptiſm. I further add, that thoſe Chriſtians which had apoſtated to the

the moſt pernitious hereſie of *Arrians* denying the deitie of Chriſt by the judgment of the Catholick Church, if they returned to her, were not to be rebaptized, but to be received again into the Church and communion thereof by repentance, as hath been proved.

5 All they that are baptized into the ſimilitude of Chriſts death and reſurrection, are but once to be baptized; but all they that are baptized according to Chriſts Inſtitution, In the name of the Father, and the Son, & the H. Ghoſt, are baptized into the ſimilitude of Chriſts death and reſurrection; therefore they are but once to be baptized: and thus the Church hath ever clearly judged. The *major* is proved, becauſe Chriſt dyed and roſe again but once: *Rom.* 6. 3, 4, 5, 9, 10. we being therefore baptized into the *ſimilitude of his death and reſurrection*, ought to be baptized but once, ſeeing that pluralities of baptiſms or baptizings cannot anſwer in ſimilitude to his death and reſurrection, who dyed and roſe again but only once for our juſtification, *Rom.* 4. 25. *Heb.* 8. 25, 26, 28. Again, we are buried with Chriſt by baptiſm, *Rom.* 6. 4. but Chriſt was but once buried; therefore neither ought we

εἰ γὰρ ἓν ἀπεθάνομεν, δὶς τεθῆναι οὐ δεῖ· ἓν γὰρ ἀπέθανεν, οὐ λέγομεν δεῖ δὶς τεθῆναι. *Chryſ. in Rom. 6. hom. 11. in eadem ſententia eſt Baſilius de S. S. c. 14. ſicut ſemel Chriſtus crucifixus eſt, ſic baptiſmus iterandus non eſt; unâ enim morte ſuâ, omnes redemit, ut amplius mori non oporteat; quod videns Eccleſia intellexit, non iterandum baptiſmum. Aug. de verâ & falſ. pœnit. c. 3. itemque de verb. Div.*

Οὔτε γὰρ δύο εἰσὶ βαπτίσματα, ἀλλὰ ἓν· ὅτε δὶς ἐσταυρώθη Χριστὸς, ἀλλ' ἅπαξ· ὅτε δὶς ἀπέθανεν ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν, ἢ ἀνέστη. *Epiph. to. 1. hæreſ. 59. l. 2. N. 5. Si Chriſtus tantum ſemel mortuus eſt, & nos tantum ſemel baptizari convenit, Alex. Alens. to. 4. de ſacrament. Baptiſ. q. 8. Memb. 12. reſol.* — *Donatum ſunt hæ ſententiæ latæ, quod confeſſus ſit ſe rebaptizaſſe, &c. quod ab eccleſia alienum eſt. Optatus, l. 1. de ſchiſm. Donat. idem lib. 5. de circumciſione dicit* — *ſemel enim factum ſervat ſalutem: ſi iterum fiat, poteſt afferre perniciem: ſic & baptiſma Chriſtianorum &c. confert gratiam; ſi repetatur, facit vitæ jacturam.* — *de hoc lavacro dixit, Qui ſemel lotus eſt, non habet iterum neceſſitatem lavandi: qui ſemel dixit, prohibuit iterum fieri* — *hæc ſententia generalis eſt, non ſpecialis* — *abſit ut lotum revocemus ad fontem* — *abſit ut iteremus quod ſemel eſt, aut dupliceмus quod unum eſt; ſemel ergo lavacrum inimus, ſemel delicta diluuntur, quia ea iterari non oportet. Tertul. de bapt. c. 15.*

Baptiſma ſalutaris aquæ ſignificatur, quod ſemel ſcilicet ſumitur, nec rurſus iteratur. Cypr. l. 2. ep. 3. ad Cæcilium, vid. & Auguſtinum ep. 173. Criſp.

Ἐάν τις ἓν αἱρέσει ἐβαπτίσθη, ἐν οἵῳ δ' ἂν εἴη, μετανοείτω· δέχεται γὰρ ὁ Θεὸς τὴν μετάνοιαν, καὶ μὴ τὸ βάπτισμα, ἐάν τις βαπτίσῃ — *Epiph. quo ſup.*

Iuxta fores templi, in latere quod opponitur meridiei — *ingreſſus templi ad Orientem erat: more primum occurrebat &c. Vatabl. in* 1 Reg. 7. 39. — *Ezek.* 36. 25. *Epheſ.* 5. 26. *Act.* 2. 38. 1 *Pet.* 3. 21. *Rom.* 8. 1.

to be baptized any more then only once. How then ſhall we be renewed after our falling into ſin? the Apoſtle ſaith, *Gal.* 6. 1. *Reſtore ſuch a one* — but how? he ſaith not baptize him again: no, but *godly ſorrow* (ſaith he, 2 *Cor.* 7.10.) *worketh repentance to ſalvation*: for we muſt ſtill remember that baptiſm is the ordinary gate and entrance into Chriſts Church: which ſtands like that *brazen Sea* at the entrance into the Temple, 1 *King.*7.39.in which our ſins are waſhed away and remitted by Chriſt,ſo,not that they ſhould be no more,but that they ſhal be no more imputed:and therfore all this life long, we have need of daily repentance (becauſe we daily fal into ſome ſin)repentance being a condition of Godspronouncing pardon to the ſenſe of our conſciences, which he ſealed to us in our baptiſm: and ſo we may underſtand that which Chriſt ſaid to *Peter*, *Joh.* 13. 10. *He that is waſh'd needeth not; ſave to waſh his feet.* We are waſhed from our ſins by baptiſm(becauſe, though we are,in reſpect of the meritorious cauſe cleanſed from them, only by the ſacred blood of Chriſt, 1 *Joh.*1.7. 1 *Pet.* 1. 19. *Heb.*9.14. *Rev.* 1.5. yet baptiſm being the ordinary external ſeal and inſtrumental cauſe, for the application thereof, as alſo in reſpect of the *analogie* between the ſign and the thing ſignified, that is often aſcribed to the ſign, which is proper to the thing ſignified, to wit, the bloud and merit of Chriſt ſealed to us in baptiſm: therefore we need no more clearing by iteration of baptiſm, but only, as it were, *waſhing our feet*, that is, our vitious affections and failings, by daily repentance, that it may pleaſe God to pronouce to our conſciences, the remiſſion of our ſins which grieve and diſpleaſe us.

Eph.5.26. Tit.3.5. 1 Pet.3.21. *Baptiſmo quidem homo totus abluitur, ſed dum iſto poſtea vivit in ſeculo, humanis affectibus terram velut pedibus calcans, &c. unde dicat dimitte nobis debita noſtra, ac ſic etiam mundatur ab eo, qui pedes lavit diſcipulis ſuis, nec deſinit interpellare pro nobis. Aug. tract.37. in Ioh.*

There is but *one Lord*, *one faith*, *one baptiſm*. *Eph.* 4. 5. That which the holy Ghoſt teſtifieth is but *one* (as *one Lord*, *one Faith*, *one Baptiſm*) no man may multiply, iterate or make more: But the holy Ghoſt teſtifieth that there is but one God, one Faith, one Baptiſm: Therefore no man may iterate or make them more: neither is it any better

better then a meer illusion of holy Scripture to distinguish between the Sacrament and the administration thereof, by saying there is but one baptism, but there may be many baptizings of one and the same person; the Apostle saying there is but one not only in the unity of substance, dispensation, and effect, but also in respect of lawful use, or reception by one and the same person; otherwise he must contradict himself, who saith we are baptized into the similitude of Christs death, which is but only one and once suffered. Indeed it is said of the other seal, *as oft as ye do this*, 1 *Cor.*11.26. but not one word in Scripture can be found for more then once baptizing: but the Apostle mentioning baptism, joins it with things incapable of multiplication, or pluralitie (one Spirit, one body of Christ, the Church, one hope of our calling, metonymically put for the thing hoped for, that is, eternal life, which is essentially but one, one Lord, one Faith, that is, one doctrine of faith, *Gal.*1.6, 7, 8. *Jud.*3 or objectively, one truth of God, one Christ) shewing that there ought to be no more baptisms then faiths, Christs, or Gods; if therefore (said *Optatus*) you give another baptism, give another faith: if ye give another faith, give another Christ: if ye give another Christ, give also another God, &c. You see to what damnable absurdities rebaptizing drives unto.

Baptisma unicum baptizatos omnes in Christo regenerans est; sicut unus Deus, ac fides unica ab omnibus fidelitèr confitendum, quod celebratum in aquâ, in nomine Patris, & Filii, & Spiritus sancti, credimus tam adultis, quàm parvulis cõmuniter perfectum remedium ad salutem. vid notas in concil. Viern. Oecumen. 15. Severin. Bin. Concil. to. 2.

——*Denique vos qui baptisma quasi libentèr duplicare contenditis, si datis alterum baptisma, date alteram fidem: si datis alteram fidem, date & alterum Christum: si datis alterum Christum, date alterum Deum. Unum Deum esse negare non potestis, ne in Marcionis foveas incidatis: ergo Deus unus est; de uno Deo unus est Christus. Qui rebaptizatur, jam Christianus fuerat: quomodo dici potest iterum Christianus &c? Optatus contr. Parm. Donatist. l.5.*

That whereby men *crucifie to themselves the Son of God afresh, and put him to open shame*, may by no means be done: But to rebaptize (or to be willingly rebaptized) in the Apostles sense, is *to crucifie to themselves the Son of God afresh, and to put him to open shame*: therefore it may by no means be done. This point the Apostle layeth down *Heb.*6.4,5,6. *It is impossible for those who were once enlightned* (saith our

See that which hath been said, part. 1. animadvers. on liberty of prophet. p. 244 245. Num 32, 33.

Tranſlation) τοὺς ἅπαξ φωτισθέντας, *who have been once baptized* (ſaith the Syriac) *to renew them again to repentance, &c.* (that is, *baptiſmal repentance, the baptiſm of repentance*, as it is called *Act* 19.4. and ſo *Heb.*10.12. *Call to remembrance the former dayes in which after ye were illuminated*, Gre. φωτισθέντες, which the Syriac (the beſt and neareſt Interpreter of the New Teſtament) rendreth, *in which ye were baptized*: So the Greeks were wont to call *baptiſm* φώτισμα illumination: poſſibly becauſe perſons converting from darkneſs of Idolatry, were ordinarily enlightned, by being taught the doctrine of the *Goſpel*, (ſee *Mat.* 4.16. *Luk.*2.32. *Act.*26.18. ſo the Hebrew יָרָה in one ſignification importing *taught*, is rendred by the LXX *illuminated*) or alſo in reſpect of extraordinary gifts of the holy Ghoſt in the knowledge of the myſteries of the Goſpel, and unſtudied tongues, with other admirable enlargments of heart, then flouriſhing in the *Church*. Now thoſe who are deſcribed *v.*4,5. who have been once baptized, and have *taſted of the heavenly gift, and were made partakers of the holy Ghoſt*, and have *taſted the good Word of God, and the powers of the world to come, if they ſhall fall away* (ſaith our Tranſlation) Gre. καὶ παραπεσόντας, *and falling away*; which (*and*) the Syriac omitteth, rendring the ſenſe (as others alſo) *non poſſunt iterum peccare, ut denuò renoventur ad reſipiſcentiam, & denuò crucifigant, &c.* they cannot ſo ſin (that is, *unto death*) that they ſhould again be renewed to repentance, and crucifie afreſh &c. that is in a *ſecond baptiſm*: where note by the way, that this place of Scripture ſo much wreſted by the enemies of truth, againſt the comfortable doctrine of the Saints perſeverance, maketh mainly for it: for the Apoſtle ſaith not, that thoſe who are deſcribed, *v.* 4, 5. do, or may fall away; but that it is impoſſible, *iſto ſuppoſito*, to be renewed, becauſe in ſuch a ſuppoſition the merit of Chriſts Croſs being aboliſhed and made void, by which they were renewed, it muſt needs follow, that ſo Chriſt ſhould be crucified afreſh, and be put to open ſhame, that they might be renewed by a ſecond and new merit of his Croſs; which ſeeing it is *impoſſible* to be, the Apoſtle will infer

לְמַעֲמוּרִיתָא נָחוּ וּ *ad baptiſmum deſcenderunt, eſſe divinam inſtitutionem quam Patres firmarunt dicit. Pauli ubi de unico baptiſmate agit, & altero, ubi negat eos qui ſemel illuminati fuerunt poſſe revocari ad pœnitentiam quam baptiſmalem intelligunt. A. Rive. Catholi. Orthod.to.2. q. 6. tract.3.*

Sic Jud. 13. 8. וְיוֹרֵנוּ & *doceat nos.* 70. καὶ φωτίζατο ἡμᾶς *& illuminabit nos*, 2 *Reg.* 17. 27. וְיוֹרֵם *& doceat eos.* 70 καὶ φωτίσῃ αὐτοὺς. *& illuminabit eos. & ib. v.*28. *ſic* 2 *Reg.* 12.2. *Eph.*3.9. καὶ φωτίσαι πάντας *illuminare &c. i. e. perſpicuè docere. Ludovic. de Dieu animadv. in Heb.*6.

See 1 Joh 3 9 & 5.16,17.

inferr that it is *impoſſible* that theſe here deſcribed *v.* 4, 5. ſhould finally fall away. The foundation of the Lord remaining ſure, and having this ſeal, *The Lord knoweth who are his*, whoſe preſcience cannot poſſibly be deceived in electing any who ſhall fall away. But to return to our purpoſe; the word ἑαυτοῖς, *to themſelves*, is very conſiderable. The Son of God they cannot now poſſibly crucifie afreſh, nor put him again to open ſhame (who ſitteth at the right hand of the glory of the Father) had they the malice of the Jews and power of the *Romans*, (who once crucified him) to help them: yet in iterating on themſelves baptiſm, the ſign of their implantation into the ſimilitude of his death, *they crucifie to themſelves* (that is, as much as in them is) *the Son of God. Chryſoſtome* excellently expreſſeth it, Baptiſm (ſaith he) is the Croſs; for therein our old man is crucified with him. Again, we have been planted together in the likeneſs of his death; as therefore Chriſt may not be crucified again (for that were to put him again to open ſhame;) ſo neither may we be baptized again: for if death have no more dominion over him; if he be riſen (in his reſurrection) a conqueror over death, &c. and ſhould again be crucified, then all theſe things were meer fables and mockeries: therefore he that rebaptizeth himſelf, doth again crucifie him. But what is crucifying again? As Chriſt died on the Croſs, ſo do we in baptiſm, not in the fleſh, but to ſin — therefore there may be no ſecond waſhing: for if there be, there may be a third, and a fourth; for the firſt is *made void by the ſecond, and that by another, even to an infinite.*

De Dieu. q. ſ. 2 Tim. 2. 19.

ὅτε γὰρ ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν ἀπέθανε) Χριστὸς ἵνα σταυρωθῇ τῷ ὑιῷ· ὅτε δικαίαι τῆς λυτρὸν δεύτερον λαμβάνῃ, &c. *Epiph. Cathar. hæreſ.* 59. N. 2.

τὸ βάπτισμα σταυρὸς ὅτι, &c. *Chryſoſt in Heb.* 6. *hom.* 9.

Where there are all the eſſential parts of baptiſm rightly adminiſtred according to the commiſſion given by Chriſt to his Apoſtles, there baptiſm cannot be made void or no true baptiſm, by any thing accidental, circumſtantial, or leſs then eſſential, neither expreſly nor by any neceſſary conſequence any where in holy Scripture forbidden. But in baptizing of Infants of Church-priviledged Parents, by ſprinkling or waſhing with water, in the name of the Father, and the Son, and the holy Ghoſt, there are all the eſſential

tial parts of baptiſm, according to Chriſts commiſſion given to the Apoſtles, (to wit, the Element and the Word which conſtitute the Sacrament.) Therefore that their baptiſm is not, neither can be made void, or no true baptiſm, by, or in reſpect of Infant-age, or of only waſhing or ſprinkling them with water (which are things circumſtantial, accidental, leſs then eſſential, and no where expreſly, or by neceſſary conſequence forbidden in holy Scripture.) So that whatever Anabaptiſts pretend in their eager purſuit of their opinion, that they do not rebaptize, ſuppoſing that there preceded no eſſential or true baptiſm in regard of the perſons being baptized in their Infancie, or becauſe they fancie dipping the whole body to be eſſential to baptiſm, and ſo neceſſary, that without it they think there can be no true baptiſm, (neither of which have any ground in Scripture) and whereas Chriſt is the Saviour of every age, ſex, and condition; therefore male and female, aged and Infants have right to the ſeal, as hath been ſhewed; it highly concerneth them ſeriouſly to conſider how dangerous a thing it is, upon a mere opinion to pull off the ſeals of their Diſciples ſalvation, under pretence of putting on a new (unwarrantable) ſeal, to renounce their Saviour, whom they put on in their lawful baptiſm, at leaſt ſacramentally; to make more baptiſms then faiths and Saviours, into the ſimilitude of whoſe death and reſurrection, all Chriſtians are baptized; and to crucifie again to themſelves the Son of God, and to put him to open ſhame. Alas, they diſcern not Satans miſchievous Legerdemain, who like a cunning finger-jugler, hereby takes from them the true ſeal of redemption and ſalvation by Chriſt, put on all his who are baptized, by pretending and ſeeming to put them on a new, better, or more perfect one.

And now Brethren, I commend you to God, & to the Word of his grace, which is able to build you up, and to give you an inheritance among all them which are ſanctified. Act.20.32.

Glory be to God in the higheſt, and on earth peace, good will towards men. Luk.2.14.

FINIS.

TRINITY COLLEGE LIBRARY CAMBRIDGE